

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. III. *New Series.*

JULY 1860.

PART VIII.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

It is a happy thing for this country that constitutional questions are not settled by abstract argument, but by precedent and prescription. Abstract argument would always be seesawing between more or less plausible views of the origin and principles of our constitution, or floundering in the fathomless depths of the "rights of man;" whereas the argument from precedents, being dry and technical, tends to clear all passion from disputes, and being definite, tends to shorten the controversy and bring it to a tangible result. Yet no one can doubt that, if the argument from precedents were always honestly conducted, it would ever carry us exactly in the contrary direction to that which "the logic of facts" would lead us to take. It would give us a dead, pedantic, antiquarian constitution to deal with one of the most progressive of populations. But the argument from precedents, though it has always been the plea, has never been the *ultima ratio* of the settlement of the disputes between the two Houses of Parliament, or between the Parliament and the Crown. Instead of the ancient precedent guiding the modern practice, it has always been seen that the new prescription has in fact devoured the old, and novelties have been authenticated as immemorial usages. Most controversies have been in fact settled by the relative strength to which each party in the State had attained at the period. Charles I. might have brought forward a much more cogent *catena* of precedents for his prerogatives than the Commons in 1671 could bring for their sole rights in the matter of taxation. Yet the constitutional question was decided against Charles and in favour of the Commons; and if Parliament had reason besides force on its side in the former case, it is more than doubtful whether the Commons had any thing but the

law of the strongest on theirs in 1671. Our greatest constitutional historian, Hallam, records the following judgment on this chapter of our history :

“If the Commons, as in early times, had merely granted their own money, it would be reasonable that their House should have, as it claimed to have, ‘a fundamental right as to the matter, the measure, and the time.’ But that the peers, subject to the same burdens as the rest of the community, and possessing no trifling proportion of general wealth, should have no other alternative than to refuse the necessary supplies of the revenue, or to have their exact proportion, with all qualifications and circumstances attending their grant, presented to them unalterably by the other House of Parliament, was an anomaly that could hardly rest on any other ground of defence than such a series of precedents as establish a constitutional usage ; while, in fact, it could not be made out that such a pretension was ever advanced by the Commons before that parliament (1671).”

To insist upon adhering woodenly and rigidly to precedents and prescription, even when reason urges a contrary course, is to resolve that, “having once been wrong, we’ll be so still.” There are maxims of our constitution which are older and more sacred than any precedent, and among these maxims one of the chief is, that “the people taxes itself;” it pays no more than it votes, and those upon whom the taxes fall determine their measure. One class does not tax another, but either each class taxes itself, or all together vote the taxes for the whole body. It was only to carry out this maxim in practice, and to guard it from being transgressed, that the Commons of England were from the earliest times so jealous of being taxed by any but themselves, whether by the king or by the Lords.

In the earliest periods of our constitutional history, the chief reason for the king’s summoning the Lords and the Commons was, that they might supply his necessities. This they did by separate grants, which they made without mutual communication ; and the Commons usually taxed themselves in a higher proportion than the Lords. Probably an attentive examination would discover in our history traces of the system which survived till our own day in Hungary, and till the French Revolution over great part of the Continent,—a system which throws all the burden of taxation on the middle and lower classes, and exempts the nobles from all contributions. A mediæval adage has come down to us, which says,

“*Deux-ace non possunt, et size-cinq solvere nolunt :*
Est igitur notum *quatre-trey* solvere totum.”

If *size-cinq*, the nobles, will not pay, and *deuce-ace*, the lower

classes, cannot, then *quatre-trey*, the middle classes, must. Under these circumstances, it is easily seen that the struggle for liberty would resolve itself into the assertion of the right of self-taxation, and the most jealous carefulness on the part of the middle classes not to allow the nobility, with all its privileges and exemptions, to impose their taxes.*

But if the Lords did not tax the Commons, the Commons, on the other hand, did not attempt to tax the Lords. Thus, 22d Edward III., the Commons granted three-fifteenths of their goods in such a manner as to show beyond a doubt that the tax was to be levied solely upon themselves. We cannot prove that the taxes imposed by the Commons were always exclusively levied upon themselves, though Hallam suspects that this was the case. "I have been almost led to suspect," he says, "by considering this remarkable exclusive privilege of originating grants of money to the Crown, as well as by the language of some passages in the rolls of Parliament relating to them, that *no part of the direct taxes*, the tenths or fifteenths of goods, were assessed upon the Lords temporal and spiritual, except when it is positively mentioned, which is frequently the case."

It may be asked, then, How is it that, under the altered circumstances, when Lords and Commons had alike become liable to the common periodical plague of the tax-gatherer's visits, the Commons still preserved their exclusive privileges? It may be replied, first, that the privilege of the Commons does not quite exclude all voice of the Lords; the Lords have a veto on any money Bill, though they have no power to alter. Moreover, they join with the Commons in passing the Bill; and grants are said to be made by both Lords and Commons. The Lords in 1671 produced the formula, "The Lords and Commons grant," as a proof that they had a right to amend money Bills. To which the Commons replied, "These words must either be understood *reddendo singula singulis*,—that is, the Lords grant for themselves, and the Commons grant for the counties, cities, and boroughs, whom they represent,"—or they are merely formal. But if the Lords had either represented large tax-paying communities, or had been large tax-payers themselves, the case would have been different, as the Commons implied when they said, "Your Lordships' proportion in all taxes, in comparison of what the commonalty pay, is very inconsiderable." In other words, though

* It appears by a letter of Humboldt to Varnhagen, in June 1839, that it had been the opinion of the Austrian statesman Gentz, that "to save the fatherland means reinstating the Prussian nobility in its privileges, and leaving it untaxed, in order that after a short negotiation it may present to the monarch its *don gratuit*."

the Lords were acknowledged to have a real joint action in making grants, yet, as their share in the payment of these grants was very small, they were never allowed to take the initiative, or to play any thing but a very subordinate part in making them.

Another circumstance continued to make the Commons jealous of the interference of the Lords, long after the nobles had lost all their exclusive privileges. In early times the Lords' interests were almost identical with those of the king; and the House of Lords was intimately connected with the king's ordinary council, which sat among the peers, and had a deliberative voice, probably till the time of Edward III. Moreover, the position and wealth of the peers gave them great influence, often an intimidating ascendancy over many members of the House of Commons. Add to this the fact, that the king's prerogative of making new peers would always put it into his power to render the House of Lords a tool in his own hands, as was seen under the Stuarts. From 1450 to 1600 there had never been more than 54 temporal Lords. James I. summoned to his first parliament 82, and to his last 96; Charles I., in 1640, summoned 119; and Charles II., in 1661, summoned 139. Many of these peerages had been created solely to counteract the policy of opposition to the Court, which had begun to manifest itself among some of the nobility, and many had been the result of purchase. Hence had arisen a notorious jealousy between the two houses, which under the Commonwealth resulted in the total suppression of the House of Lords. This jealousy still smouldered in 1671, and no doubt lent an asperity to the dispute, and enabled the Commons to rely on the country for support in an extension of their privileges, which was neither sanctioned by precedent nor required by sound reasons.

But these jealousies, however they may have influenced the decision of 1671, were not capable of being reduced to pleas and arguments. The two grounds on which the Commons established their privileges against the Lords were: the non-representative character of the peers, and the comparatively small portion of the taxation which fell directly upon them. Now in deciding the present case of privilege, it becomes necessary to ask whether these arguments still remain as valid as they were in 1671. As for the first, Mr. Bright and his party assume that the question remains precisely as it did in 1671. The issue that he challenges is this, "Shall we submit to be taxed by an irresponsible body, or shall we hold fast to that constitutional maxim of our fathers which declared that taxation and representation should be inseparable." It is still

true that the aristocracy does not represent, that is, it does not represent technically and directly; for it is not elective. But the question now to be settled is, whether it has not a virtual representation. In 1671 there was no question of virtual representation; those classes which enjoyed the franchise at all were directly and really represented. In our enormously increased population, several classes have now to be contented with a merely indirect and virtual representation. For we must not forget that the law which gives the man who lives in a house assessed at 10*l.* an equal influence on the constitution with a man whose house is assessed at 100*l.*, has in fact taken away the direct representation of the higher classes of gentry in the House of Commons. It only requires the action of time and the increase of population to make the disfranchisement of these classes complete, directly and indirectly too. It is already ascertained that to give an equal weight to high and low in constituencies like the metropolitan, is practically to deprive the best classes of all representation. It is only in the less numerous and less homogeneous constituencies that the educated classes retain any power; and there it is not a legal power that can be securely counted upon, but only a more or less evanescent influence. The poorer classes acknowledge the influence of manner and bearing, and feel the nameless charm of refinement; and they accord personal confidence to a gentleman more easily than to one of their own order. But any one can see that the tenure of this influence is social, not political. A political feeling that seized the lower classes like an epidemic would discover to them that they have in their own hands, without any revolutionary measures, the tiller of the state.

Now when whole classes of men find that they are only indirectly represented, they must necessarily look on the representative system as something less definite and tangible than it was when they, as well as the other classes of the nation, had their own direct representatives secured to them by the letter of the law, as well as by their social influence. Where all representation is indirect, there any institution which secures the expression of the feelings, opinions, and interests of a certain class, is some real representation of that class. Now our position is, that even at present the House of Lords equally with the House of Commons has already become the indirect representative of the gentry, of the classes that pay income-tax, and that it must become more and more so with the increase of population, with the spread of knowledge and of organisation among the lower classes, and especially with the development of parliamentary

reform on the principles of 1832. The House of Lords, as a feudal council of the king's peers, representing no one but themselves, is completely out of date, and appears like an anomaly in our constitution. The House of Lords, as the virtually representative Chamber of the upper classes,—of all who in mediæval Latin would have been called *nobiles*, Anglicè gentlemen, of gentle blood,—may possibly have a grand future before it, as the necessary balance of a further reformed House of Commons.

The word *nobilis* was of much more extended signification than our English word 'nobility.' A *nobilis* was a king's man, or baron, who held his land directly from the Crown. All these barons had originally the same right of forming part of the king's council. But probably, in consequence of their numbers, this constitution of things had become impracticable in King John's days. Hence the new constitution of Magna Charta provided that they should be divided into two estates, making up together the king's council; the first estate, or the greater barons, to be summoned personally by king's writ; the second estate of the lesser barons to be summoned by the sheriffs, to give, not personal, but representative attendance; for with personal attendance they would have filled all the council chambers in London. The words of the great Charter are clear:

"In order to have a common council of the kingdom to assess aid, we will cause to be summoned all archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and *greater barons* severally, by our letters sealed; and further, we will cause to be summoned generally by our sheriffs and bailiffs all those who hold of us in chief to come to us on a certain day."

Whatever definition we give of *greater barons*, it is clear that by the terms of the great Charter the right of a summons to the Parliament was inherent in every freeholder who held of the king in chief. The only distinction was whether they were to give personal or only representative attendance. And this was determined by no consideration of family or blood, but only by the greater or less amount of land held in fee, as we may infer from the uncertainty of the peerage in early times,—men being summoned as barons to one parliament, and not summoned to the next.

Hence the term *nobiles* belonged as truly to the second estate as to the first. When the boroughs were summoned to send burgesses to the second House, a new element was introduced—the people; and of these two, the lower nobility and the people, the House of Commons was said to be composed. Thus the Duke de Bouillon writes in 1596: "The

state of England is divided into three parts—the Church, the nobility, and the people: of these the parliament consists. Of the Church, the prelates alone have seats (of personal right); of the nobility, the barons alone, who are about sixty-four in number, and no more. The remainder of the Church and nobility vote with the people, and by representatives.” This distinction still survives in our knights of the shires, as contrasted with the burgesses of the boroughs.

We must of course make allowances for the change of our constitution from that of a feudal state to its present mixed form. The names remain, but the things are only virtually or representatively the same. The barons or peers are no longer those who hold territorial baronies, neither are the *nobiles* any longer those who hold in chief of the king. Nobility and gentry still exist, but their definition is changed. Whether the House of Lords has any right to change or not, it has changed, and from a council of territorial lords and magistrates, each with power of “high, middle, and low” justice in his own domain, it has become a Chamber of hereditary legislators, who only accidentally, or by a continual exercise of the royal prerogative in creating new peers, happen to belong to the wealthiest and most powerful families in the kingdom. In the same way the lower nobility or gentry have changed; their definition is no longer by their domains, but by their education or their wealth. The income-tax as a test has succeeded to the freehold test, and the present peers have precisely the same relation to the payers of income-tax as the greater barons of old had to the freeholders.

But in their relations with the “people,” the gentry by no means hold the same place which they formerly occupied. The popular or democratic element long ago succeeded in inserting the little end of the wedge, and has been ever since occupied in driving it home; so that the gentry can no longer count upon their old preponderance in the House of Commons; hitherto they have indirectly, by influence and by the momentum of their former speed, retained much of their power. But their tenure is manifestly insecure, and they subsist partly on the ignorance, partly on the good-nature of their rivals; elbowed, or in process of being elbowed, out of the House of Commons, their prospects are not much better in the Upper House, so long as the representative system is altogether repudiated by the peers.

And yet it is only on the ground of their being virtually a representative body that the peers are at all likely to maintain the privilege they have so boldly asserted. If they sit

and vote in Parliament simply for themselves, then, notwithstanding their vast increase in numbers, the share of the national burdens borne by the 410 temporal peers who now have seats is probably not so great, certainly not greater, when compared with the wealth of the other classes of the empire, than was the share of the burdens borne by the 150 peers in 1671, whose proportion was said to be "very inconsiderable," and who were therefore prohibited from making the slightest modification in money Bills.

The case, then, seems to us to stand thus: if the peers may prevent the Commons repealing a tax, they are to have the power of continuing a tax, and therefore virtually the power of taxation; if this, which certainly would not have been permitted in 1671, is to be allowed in 1860, the reason must be that the circumstances of the nation are so changed as to deprive the arguments relied upon by the Commons two centuries ago of their force. The peers must now be considered to represent (indirectly of course) certain classes whose representation in the Commons is either inadequate or insecure; and by virtue of this representation, the proportion of fiscal burdens which they and their constituents bear must now entitle them to join in settling the taxation, if they are to be considered so entitled.

We have, then, on one side the upper classes gradually losing their direct and secure representative preponderance in the Commons; on the other, we have the Lords asserting a privilege which, on the principles of the last two centuries, can only belong to them on the supposition that they are virtually a representative body. Do not these two facts suggest the congruity of developing this element in the Lords? And what could be a greater bulwark for the peers against the democratical attack on their very existence which is looming in no very distant future, than to make them, or part of them, the real and direct representatives of the English gentry, and in virtue of this representation to restore to them a coördinate power of settling the taxes with the Commons?

We are quite aware that it is simply Utopian to expect that the peers will voluntarily agree to any thing that looks like a reform of their House or order. They consider that they are the constant element in our constitution, and that they have no right to change. The vigour with which they resisted the creation of life-peerages is still fresh in our memory. Yet they have changed with the times, and most certainly will change again. At first all peerages were territorial; every one who held a barony of the king, that is, a territorial estate for which the holder paid 100 marks of

yearly relief, was entitled, at the discretion of the king, to be summoned by writ as a baron. The king had no right to summon any man whose property was too small for the honour. The honour followed the property, as the earldom of Arundel follows the possession of Arundel Castle, and as the possessor of Berkeley Castle claims the barony as attached to the estate.

Richard II. was the first to introduce the present practice of making the title and the seat in Parliament a personal honour, descending in fee-tail male, instead of going to the heirs general with the property. This was a real revolution; before this the House of Lords was necessarily the representative of the wealth of the country. Since the new principle was established, it may any day happen, and must some day happen, to all noble families, that the property goes one way and the honours another, and that the peerage is left without sufficient funds to support the dignity. The nearest modern equivalent to the peerage as it existed before Richard II. would be, we imagine, if the Queen was able at her discretion to summon to each parliament all or any of those who yearly paid more than a given large sum in direct taxes: the summons, unless it was renewed, giving no permanent title, and even if it was renewed, the title not necessarily passing to the man's heir. We are not advocating such a measure; we only put the imaginary case to show how great has been the change, and how different is the reality from what analogy might have led us to expect.

Another great change is in the very matter upon which the present question hinges. The Lords had originally a voice in money Bills; and by the principle that all who pay taxes have a right to a voice in their imposition, they should still have it. Yet they were gradually excluded from this privilege, and, stranger still, they acquiesced in their exclusion.

The suppression of the monasteries was another revolution in the House of Lords. By that measure the clergy lost about thirty-six votes; these, added to the twenty-two bishops, gave the ecclesiastics a clear majority over the temporal peers, whose number under Henry VIII. was never greater than fifty-one.

In 1719 the Lords themselves attempted a revolution still more serious. A Bill was introduced, and read twice in the House of Lords without a division, "to settle and limit the peerage in such a manner that the number of English peers should not be enlarged beyond six of the present number, which, upon failure of issue male, might be supplied by new creations; that instead of the sixteen elective peers from Scotland, twenty-five should be made hereditary in that part

of the kingdom ; and that this number, upon failure of heirs male, should be supplied from the other members of the Scotch peerage." Thus the Crown was to be deprived of the prerogative of creating peers at will ; for it was thought that if succeeding monarchs were to follow the example of Queen Anne, and create a dozen peers at a batch, there could be no security as to the principles or votes of the House of Lords. We have seen in our own day an example of this, when the Lords were intimidated into passing the Reform Bill of 1832 by the threat of the ministry to create as many new peers as would give the liberals a majority in the House.

Another attempt to change the character of the Upper House has been recently made, and defeated by the Lords. Lord Palmerston attempted to reform the abuse of drafting whole sections of the upper classes into an hereditary peerage (for this is the practical result of the present facility of creating peers) by raising the law-lords to life-peerages. In introducing his reform, he neither declared its limits, nor argued its necessity ; but he dwarfed his object into the concoction of a mere technical court of appeal, and rested on some precedent raked out of the annals of one of the Plantagenets. If he failed, it by no means follows that the question of life-peerages is yet settled.

There are, therefore, precedents and possibilities of change in the constitution of the House of Lords. Neither are there wanting elements on which these latent forces may act : the principle of representation is an instance. It is sometimes said that there is nothing representative in the House of Lords. This is scarcely true ; for though the constituents represented are only the Scotch and Irish peers, yet the admission of the principle of representation evidently affords an entrance to a further development of it ; especially when the constituencies represented have notoriously become mere rotten boroughs that cry out aloud for reform.

At the time of the union with Scotland there were 157 Scotch peers ; it was agreed that these should be represented by 16, elected for each parliament, in the English House of Lords. At first the terms of the union were interpreted to mean that no Scotch peer, created a British peer subsequently to the union, could take his seat as such, but that the 16 representative peers covered the whole Scotch peerage. This rule held good from 1711 to 1782, when the Lords gave way, and have been since flooded with Scoto-British peers. The number of Scotch peers has diminished to 82 ; these now not only send their 16 direct representatives to the House of Lords, but are also indirectly represented by 41 more who

sit as British peers, and by a very large number of Scotch commoners who have been created British peers since the union; so that we now have some 60 Scoto-British peers in the House, besides the 16 representatives.

By the terms of the Irish union 28 peers are elected for life to represent the Irish peerage. In 1801 there were 224 Irish, of whom 46 were also British peers; now the number is 194, of whom 74 are also in the British peerage. Thus, in 1801, a constituency of 178 returned 28 direct and 46 indirect representatives; now a constituency of 120 has 28 direct and 74 indirect representatives. Clearly, if the terms of the union were fair, the present influence of the Irish and Scotch peerage in the House is excessive, and their representative peers might be fairly taken from them. In such a case, what objection would there be to extending the constituencies of these 44 elective peers so as to make them the representatives, not of their present close boroughs, but of all the untitled aristocracy and wealth of the three kingdoms? And would not this extension be the very title-deed and diploma of the privileges which they are now bent upon maintaining?

Such a development would be consonant to the analogies of our history. By the terms of the great Charter there are two houses of *nobiles*: the one personal, consisting of the earls and greater barons; the other elective, consisting of the representatives of the smaller barons or knights and freeholders. To these was added in after times a third estate,—the trading class, or people; but as they were added gradually, they had not a house apart, but sat and voted in the representative chamber of the *nobiles*. The untitled aristocracy preserved their legal preponderance in the Lower House till 1832, when the Reform Bill gave the direct power to the upper strata of the estate of the “people.” With the progress of reform it seems clear that the untitled aristocracy will gradually lose, not only their direct and legal preponderance, but also the indirect influence which they have as yet triumphantly maintained. The question therefore suggests itself, whether some gentle and gradual alteration in the distribution of the three estates among the two Houses is not possible—whether we might not find some small place for the untitled aristocracy in the Upper House, when they are being squeezed and elbowed out of the Lower House by the advancing tide of the democracy? It would seem to be a just balance to any lowering of the franchise for the election of members of the House of Commons, that the virtually disfranchised portion of the upper classes should have some few direct representatives in the Upper House, and that the Lords should in

consequence be permitted to resume their coördinate power in the imposition of taxes.

It would be easy to draw out a definite plan for the development or creation of the representative system in the Lords; but it would be childish to do so till the preliminary question is settled—whether directly or indirectly, potentially or actually, there is in the Upper House any element which is, or which ought to be, or which can easily be made to be, representative of any other class of constituents than the actual titled aristocracy. We know full well that it is a constitutional heresy to maintain the representative character of the Lords. Lord Shelburne once asserted it in his place in Parliament to Burke's indignation. But Church and State differ in this, that in the latter heresies may in time come round to be orthodox doctrines; for only constant facts can be described in unchanging formulas.

A much greater heresy would be to draw too trenchant a line between the two Houses. Nothing would be easier than to push our argument to a most mischievous excess in this direction. It is therefore necessary to protest, that as we have no desire, so we have no expectation, of seeing the upper classes totally excluded from the Commons, and gaining in compensation a representative voice in the Lords, so that the Upper House should become the exclusive representative of the aristocracy,—of birth, wealth, and education,—and the Lower House that of trade and labour. The present temperament is best, where the upper classes as well as, or even more than, the lower classes are represented in the Commons, though neither the peers nor the poorest classes have the franchise. In a representative chamber no class can be safely excluded, as Guizot found to his cost. And the merit of Lord John Russell's measure of Reform is, that he wishes to enfranchise a portion of the labouring class, so that no common interest will be without its direct representation in the Commons. We applaud his purpose, but we distrust his means.

It seems probable that any universal and homogeneous measure of Reform will either give the newly-enfranchised classes power everywhere, or power nowhere. If nowhere, the measure is futile; if everywhere, it is revolutionary. It may be said that the actual variety in the circumstances of those whose holdings are rated at 6*l.* in different boroughs provides for the necessary differentiation, and thus for the actual and direct representation of all classes. But it must be remembered that every where and universally the immense majority of voters will be those whose holdings are rated

under 15*l.* annually, and that their preponderance will be the virtual disfranchisement of the whole class of gentry. Doubtless there will be differences in the remainder ; when all the mountains are levelled, there may still remain undulations in the plain. But these trifling differences in elevation are no better representatives of the differentiated constituencies of old times, than, in the eyes of the tourist, the steepest gradients of a railway, or the occasional views from a viaduct, make up for the long hills and the extensive prospects of the old coach-road.

Thus between an exclusive House of Lords and a democratic House of Commons, the real aristocracy of the kingdom would be nowhere. The most important common interest of the country would be gradually eliminated from all share in the government. Those who would bear nearly the whole burden of the taxation, which a reformed House of Commons would try to make direct instead of indirect, would have no share in its imposition or in its management. Both for its own sake and for the sake of this disfranchised class, we think that the House of Lords, without any detriment to its true historical and prescriptive character, might advantageously open its doors, and develop some of the latent principles of its organisation. It seems to us the only plan by which the growing distance between the two Houses can be bridged over. The gentry is at present the link between them ; as this link becomes less firmly imbedded in the Commons, the eliminated portion should find a new bed in the Lords, or its extrusion from one will only serve to push the other House further away. And no one can blink the danger of drawing the line of separation between the two Houses too strongly and clearly. The antagonism ought always to be broken by the admission of an element of each in the other ; and though under no circumstances can we imagine that the gentry will ever be entirely unrepresented in the Commons, yet we desire to see that, as their influence dwindles there, it may increase in another place, so as to keep the link between the Houses up to the required mark of efficiency and strength. In favouring such a wish, the titled aristocracy would enlist the great bulk of the present payers of direct taxation on its side ; for it would attract the sympathies of all who fear lest in course of time, and with a reformed House of Commons, the lower classes will impose, and the upper will only pay, the taxes, unless some coördinate and controlling power can be secured to the Upper House.

HEFELE'S LIFE OF XIMENES.*

PROFESSOR HEFELE of Tübingen has acquired by his excellent History of the Councils a very great name in the ecclesiastical literature of our time. His *Life of Ximenes*, though a clever and successful work, is not distinguished by the same profound research, and it does not possess the advantage of manuscript information, which gives a real value to all the writings of Prescott. Though it is unquestionably the best history of the great Cardinal, the popularity it has acquired is probably chiefly due to the critique of Llorente's History of the Inquisition. Even on this subject, however, it brings to light no new matter, and repeats with great point and fulness, but little addition, much that has been often urged before. The author has not entirely escaped that partial and argumentative tone of apology and advocacy which was during the last generation so common among Catholic historians, and which sanctioned and almost justified the method of the Protestant and infidel writers, whose conclusions they questioned, and not unfrequently disproved. This may perhaps be attributed partly to the insidious influence which biography exercises over those who write it. For that most entertaining branch of literature is also the most apt to distort the facts and proportions of history, by the interest with which the hero inspires his biographer. For a person is more attractive than a principle, and an impartial biography is far more rare than an impartial history. In proportion as a cause is bad in itself, it becomes necessary to exalt those who are its representatives. This is one great reason of that unfairness of Protestant writers which is often unjustly attributed to hatred of the Catholic Church. A reforming party cannot admit that those who instituted the reformation were not really better than those who rejected it. It is unreasonable to expect of a zealous Protestant that he will give up the characters of his leaders, or recognise the superiority of Catholic heroes. Infidels and rationalists are not so bound. They do not look for authorities. They depend on themselves, and make their own subjective consciousness the supreme test of truth. Their case does not stand upon the merits of any set of men, and they may be perfectly disinterested in all disputes regarding persons. Indeed, their attention is more particularly directed to the impersonal

* *The Life of Cardinal Ximenes.* By Dr. von Hefele; translated from the German by the Rev. Canon Dalton. Catholic Publishing Company, 1860.

forces in history, and it is in this way that they have erected the philosophy of history into a scientific system of laws. For this reason also they are so often astonishingly fair and favourable in their judgment upon men whom it has been a Protestant tradition to denounce. In many particulars their views approach very nearly to those of Catholics, and their method of investigation is more Catholic than their results often are. They have made the progress of learning independent of the interests of parties, and by this means have rendered the greatest service to the Church. Unfortunately we ourselves have not escaped the influence of Protestant examples. We too often think that the cause of our religion is at stake in the vindication of some great character, and degrade what is divine to the level of human weakness. We do not keep sufficiently distinct the purposes of edification and of scientific research; consequently our interests are often safer in the keeping of others than in our own.

At any rate, Canon Dalton deserves our thanks for bringing this work within reach of English readers. He has been assisted by a German gentleman, who will be able to be of great use in introducing us to the Catholic literature of his country, when he has succeeded in acquiring greater correctness and facility of language. Canon Dalton has brought to bear upon the undertaking a great love for the subject, knowledge of foreign literature, zeal for the cause of religion, some acquaintance with several Spanish books that were not known to Hefele, and some gleanings from the literary gossip of Valladolid. His greatest merit is a perfectly disinterested and good-humoured love of truth—at all times a rare possession. It frequently appears in the Introduction, and in the notes he has appended to the work. When, for instance, Hefele says that when the Council of Toledo decreed the expulsion of the Jews, in consequence of their having conspired against the state, it was intended only to banish those who had actually joined in the treason, his translator gives an extract in a note to show that in fact all were banished. It is equally characteristic of his notions of historical science, that he attempts to control Hefele's statement by quoting in Spanish the text of a council of the seventh century; or that he concludes that the older Spanish writers "had better means of appreciating the character" of Torquemada than Mr. Prescott, *because* "they speak of him with the highest respect." But in spite of such defects as these, the simplicity and sincerity of his remarks oblige us to overlook the claims of strict criticism in admiration of the great scenes he has brought once more before us.

In the Introduction Mr. Dalton endeavours to modify Hefele's view of the political origin and purpose of the Inquisition. We will not say that he proves his case; but at the same time this portion of the original is so very defective, that we will join the translator in his attempt to improve and to correct it. Any discussion of the subject must, however, be considered premature, whilst a work which has long been in preparation by a laborious Frenchman, Mr. Du Boys, who has occasionally contributed some fragments to the *Catholic Reviews*, remains unpublished.

It is in reality an idle inquiry whether the most powerful and characteristic of the national institutions of Spain owed its establishment to political or religious considerations, for at that time they were nearly identical in Spain. The existence from the first of a political element is manifest from the fact that the old Inquisition still subsisted in Aragon at the time when the new one was introduced, and had frequently taken cognisance of those religious transgressions against which the new tribunal was peculiarly directed. If, therefore, religious motives had alone prevailed, it would have been enough to extend the inquisition of Aragon to the kingdom of Castile. This was not done, simply because a purely ecclesiastical tribunal would not have served the purpose of the Catholic kings. The new inquisition was, in fact, more particularly wanted against the *Maranos* of Aragon. But it was first introduced in Castile because it was thought that the liberties of the Aragonese would put some obstacle in the way. There is no doubt, however, that Hefele, following the lead of De Maistre, a most seductive but unsafe guide in matters of history, has exaggerated the extent to which purely political motives influenced the Spanish sovereigns. The character of the tribunal became afterwards chiefly secular; and the royal power, not the Church, derived the chief profit from its existence. But that advantage was obtained in an almost equal degree during the earlier period, when its whole constitution and action were entirely ecclesiastical. For there is no greater auxiliary of absolute power than the presence in the state of an oppressed religious body; and no government is more powerful than one in whom the people behold its vigilant guardian against an enemy of its religion. Tyrants, says Herrera, always cover themselves with the mantle of religion.* It was in their capacity of defenders of the faith, by virtue, therefore, of the tribunal by which they fulfilled that duty, that the kings of Spain, even at the time

* "Todos los tiranos se cubren siempre con el manto de la religion." *Hist. de la Indias occid.* dec. v. lib. iii. cap. 8.

of their worst misgovernment, retained the obedience and the love of their subjects. Thus, in 1770, Burke, instituting a comparison between the revenue of George III., which, including a civil list of 800,000*l.*, he estimated at more than a million, and the ostensible expenses of the court, affirmed that the greater portion of it served to increase, by means of corruption, the unconstitutional power of the crown. But a larger sum than that which at the close of the eighteenth century seemed dangerous to the liberties of the nation, was drawn at the beginning of the seventeenth century, by our most despotic king, from the Catholic ransom. It would not be difficult to show that the rise of the system of penal laws coincided with the excessive growth of the monarchical power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its decline with the progress of political freedom in the eighteenth and the nineteenth, when the strongest resistance to Catholic emancipation was offered by the crown. In Spain, in like manner, the king owed his great power to his zeal for religion; and the provision for defending the one inevitably promoted the other. The existence of the State had depended for centuries upon its resistance to hostile religions; and the vigour with which the Inquisition pursued heretics, infidels, and Jews, had its origin in the danger which at different times the State encountered from all three. The Spanish monarchy was first securely established by the victory of Catholicism over Arianism. The victory over the Moors of Granada was the commencement of its unparalleled ascendancy in the affairs of Europe. After waging almost incessantly for 700 years a holy war for their hearths and homes, the Spaniards commenced in the fifteenth century a crusade against the Reformation. They grew accustomed to consider national interests identical with religious, and never understood that their religious wars were exhausting the country, or that the absolutism of the crown, which was their pride, was degrading the Church at home. Their zeal for the faith made them blind to the ruin of the State, and their patriotism concealed from them the disastrous condition of the Church. The time came when the danger of heresy had passed away, and the Inquisition, as a religious tribunal, had done its work. Then the political element which had lurked in it from the beginning survived alone, and absorbed the whole activity of the tribunal. Its constitution was not altered, and it served the State in the same way that it had seemed to serve the Church. In the eyes of a Spaniard of true blood there was no difference in principle between the crime of the relapsed Jew who was burned by Torquemada, and that of

the smuggler who was denounced to the Holy Office under the Bourbons.

The religious intolerance of which the Inquisition is the most striking expression holds a conspicuous place in the history of Spain, from the time of its conquest by the Arian Visigoths. There, as well as in Italy and in southern Gaul, the Gothic kings found that their dominion was uncertain and precarious so long as a barrier of religious animosity separated the conquerors from the natives. The national hostility of the Roman people would have been overcome in time by intermarriage, and by the superiority of the government of the Goths to that of the emperor, who was hardly less an alien than they. This superiority was so strongly felt, that the conquest seemed to many a deliverance—*ut inveniantur quidam Romani qui malint inter barbaros pauperem libertatem quam inter Romanos tributariam sollicitudinem sustinere*.* But whilst Arianism was the religion of the Gothic state, and Catholicism that of the Roman nation, a durable union was impossible. The religious question determined the existence of all the new kingdoms. The immediate conversion of the Franks from the worship of Odin to the religion of the people at once rendered the monarchy of the Merovingians the most stable and the most powerful of all the Teutonic conquests. The fate of the Goths in Italy was equally significant. Though founded and governed by the wisest and ablest chief who appeared in the age of the great migration, their monarchy never took root among the people in consequence of their Arianism, and was completely and speedily destroyed. Theodoric sought to avoid every occasion of discontent. He gave the Romans their own laws and liberties, and sought to destroy neither the religion nor the institutions of imperial Italy. This very tolerance was fatal to his throne. His people remained strangers in the land. They formed a separate state, governed by its own laws, and supported by its own power, without the help or the sympathy of the Italians; and they were compelled to meet the armies of Justinian in the midst of the ill-will of the people they had delivered.

The lesson of contemporary history was not lost upon the Gothic kings in Spain, where there was every sign that the same causes would produce like results. It became the first maxim of their policy that their power could be consolidated only through the union in the same religion of the dominant and the subject races. Naturally they strove to impose their own belief upon the people. For all the Goths clung with

* Orosius, vii. 38.

a strange tenacity to the form in which they had first known Christianity. For this the Ostrogoths were exterminated; and the Visigoths did not yield until it had cost them Aquitaine, and threatened to ruin their power in the Peninsula. The adoption of Arianism by the Spanish people would confirm the supremacy of the ruling race, and would break off for ever the connection between their subjects and the Catholic empire. Unity and independence seemed alike to call for the predominance of the Arian faith; accordingly Lewigild set about converting the Catholic Spaniards. First he tried conciliation. An Arian synod at Toledo abolished the practice of rebaptising the Catholics who joined the Arian communion. When it was found that this concession was ineffectual, severer means were adopted, and a persecution commenced, which led to a partial apostasy, but ended in a civil war. Warned by his example, his son and successor Recared sought the same political results in another policy. Whilst his father had provoked an armed resistance in attempting to force Arianism upon the Spaniards, Recared found that there was no resistance and no difficulty in converting all the Arians to Catholicism. The danger of religious differences had nowhere been more keenly felt, and was nowhere more deeply feared, than in Spain; and the preservation of religious unity became a political principle, to which, in almost every age, the most stupendous sacrifices continued to be made, and were made in vain.

The Jews form the connecting link between the intolerance of the Goths and that of the later Inquisition, and they contributed more than any other religious party to its introduction. Their persecutions had begun at the conversion of Recared, when the principle of religious unity was first made a law of the State. At that time they were already numerous, and began to consider Spain as a new land of promise, and the scene of their future greatness. Under the Moors, these hopes were partly realised. Cordova, Granada, Toledo, says the greatest of their modern historians, sound like home and household names to a Jewish ear, as much as Jerusalem or Tiberias. They asserted that they had been settled in the country ever since the days of Solomon, in order to prove that they had no part in the death of Christ. Previous to the Teutonic invasion they were no molested. The Theodosian code only forbids them to possess Christian slaves, or to build new synagogues, and to hold judicial or military offices. Under the Arian Goths they retained their own laws. At Naples they exhibited their gratitude by defending the city against Belisarius. At Rome

the people plundered their houses and burnt their synagogue, in order to spite their protector Theodoric.

In Spain the Jews and Christians lived on the best terms together. They frequently intermarried; and one of the first Spanish Councils had occasion to forbid the faithful to allow their crops to be blessed by Jews. Christian slaves were common in Jewish houses. It is remarkable how little abhorrence of the Jews was manifested by the Christians in the age which immediately followed their crime, and when the remembrance of the terrible expiation under Titus and Hadrian was fresh in all men's minds. The germs of an altered feeling were laid during the Arian ascendancy. The Goths protected and preferred the Jews. They were more highly civilised, more adapted to civil offices, than the Goths themselves, and they were not by their religion, like the Catholics, natural allies of the Emperor. Whilst the Goths and the Spaniards were governed by their separate laws, the Jews were often admitted to authority over the Spaniards, but never over the Goths. The restrictions imposed upon them by the Roman law were no longer enforced; consequently the evils which those restrictions had been designed to prevent began to spread, and at the conversion of the Goths a reaction ensued which aimed at first only at the restoration of the Theodosian law. The Council of Toledo, under Recared, at once decreed that they should not hold civil offices, *per quæ eis occasio tribuatur pœnam Christianis inferre*. They were not to have Christian wives, and the children of mixed marriages were to be baptised. The most important point was, that they were forbidden to have Christian slaves. Under the empire the law obliged them to purchase heathen slaves wherever they could be got, and it sometimes happened that a slave, to escape from a Jewish master, professed to have been a Christian. As the Goths did not enforce the Theodosian decree, it became more and more common for Christians to be made the slaves of Jews. Now it was particularly offensive to a Jew to have in his house persons who did not obey his ceremonial law; and the Talmud ordained that the slaves should either be circumcised or sold again. This was a great danger and injury to religion, and it is due to the intolerance of the Jews themselves that the first oppressive measures were adopted against them. It has never been their practice to modify their regulations so as to make them more palatable to the Christians. Not many years ago, when the removal of their civil disabilities was being debated in several European Parliaments, one of their most eminent writers urged in vain the abrogation of that precept by which

it is made lawful to cheat a Christian. So it was in Spain in the seventh century. It was morally impossible for a Jew to permit his Christian slaves to profess their own religion. It was materially impossible for him to exist without slaves. Heathens could no longer be got. So long as the Jews were Jews, it seemed that the Catholic faith would be constantly exposed to a great profanation and injury. Something required to be done. Then, in the first moment of the victory over Arianism, in the midst of the strong political reaction towards religious unity, a measure was resolved upon which has thrown a gloom over the whole history of Spain, which proved in its results injurious to the Church, pernicious to the State, and which was the real cause of the establishment of the Inquisition, and of the consequences which ensued. King Sisebut, in the year 612, decreed that all the Jews who did not consent to be baptised should leave the country before a certain date. Many preferred exile to apostasy. A large number remained, and were baptised. It is evident that the government imagined that Judaism could be as easily renounced as Arianism, and that they had no conception of its vitality, or of the vigour of the Jewish belief. St. Isidore censured the act of the king: *emulationem quidem Dei habuit, sed non secundum scientiam*; but it was supposed that even if those who had been converted by violence should never become sincere Christians, their errors would not be inherited by their children.* The great evil of the measure lay in the success which partly attended it.

A few years later the law of Sisebut was repealed, the exiles returned, and the converts relapsed. In the year 633, at a council at Toledo, in which Isidore of Seville was the leading mind, it was determined that the Jews were not to be converted by force or by threats, but that those who had once been baptised could not be permitted to return to their old errors. Those who persisted were to be reduced to slavery. Henceforward they continued to be regarded as heretics and apostates, and no relaxation of the severities against the Jews brought any relief to them. The government could not escape from the terrible consequences of the first compulsory conversion, by which an element of unbelief and hypocrisy was introduced into the Church, which she could neither crush nor cast out. The establishment of the Spanish Inquisition was a last desperate effort to remedy the conse-

* "Nec hoc inutiliter facimus, si pro levandis pensionum oneribus eos ad Christi gratiam perducamus, quia etsi ipsi minus fideliter veniunt, hi tamen qui de eis nati fuerint jam fidelius baptizantur." *Gregory the Great*, Epist. v. 8.

quences of that fatal measure. It was the last practical development of the system inaugurated by the councils of Toledo against a danger from which the Church of Spain had never ceased to suffer, and which she never ceased to combat. A learned Jewish historian says: "The real necessity and possibility of such a tribunal lay simply in the dread of the gigantic influence of the converted Jews in society and religion. However we may curse the names of those on whom lie the tears and the blood of thousands of innocent men, one thing excuses them—that what they desired to extirpate had struck such deep root that it could be removed only by the greatest energy and exemplary severity." At first the Jews themselves felt no evil consequences from the Inquisition. Six years after its introduction Abarbanel was holding high financial office; and in his introduction to his commentary on the Book of Kings, he describes the condition of his people as in no way worse than before. There was so little fanaticism in the popular mind against them, that when Philip the Fair died, his death was attributed to the part he had taken in their expulsion. But the presence of the Jews was incompatible with the real conversion of the *conversos*. It was only by isolation that these could be made to surrender their practices, and that the influence of their religion could be neutralised. The Inquisition had a hopeless task with the relapsed, so long as the real Jews were tolerated. Therefore, as soon as the Moors were expelled from Granada, Ferdinand resolved that the Jews should either follow them or receive baptism. As the first persecution had followed immediately on the defeat of Arianism, the prospect of perfect unity opened by the fall of Granada led to a new attempt to coerce them. Accordingly it was decreed that all who refused baptism should leave Spain, and that they should take no coined money with them. The menace of confiscation added to that of exile would, it was expected, prove irresistible; and people were so little prepared for the great emigration that ensued, that alarm was expressed, not at the loss which the country would suffer by the execution of the decree, but at the danger to the purity of the Spanish blood from intermarriage with so many converted Jews.* Nevertheless, 300,000 Jews went into poverty and exile. In all matters relating to the Jews Hefe is very unsatisfactory, as he has neglected to make use of Jewish authorities. But there is no country in which

* "No agradó á algunos este mandato de los reyes, por lo que ellos sospechaban, y especialmente por la mucha mezela que á la nobleza d'España avian de causar con sus casamientos." *Garibay, Compendio Historial*, lib. xix. cap. 1.

they played a more important part than Spain, and nowhere is so much information to be obtained for national history from their writings. It is, however, a source that has been little explored by Christian writers.

Another most important part of the history of the Inquisition into which he has failed to inquire, is its position in the Church. It was the great barrier to the exercise of the Papal authority in Spain, and practically secured to the crown all the power which in France was aimed at by the Gallican system. The manner in which the rights of the Holy See were appropriated by means of it, and the contests between the court of Rome and the Spanish government on questions of jurisdiction,* may be found in the works of the Spanish canonists. It appears to us that this is the portion of the history of the Inquisition by which most light may yet be thrown upon its character, and its influence on the destinies of Spain; all the information given on this topic by our author consists in an extract from Ranke's *Spain in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*.†

It will be found that it was most injurious to the Church, whom it was its mission to protect. No other ecclesiastical institution was ever so completely exempt from the Papal jurisdiction; none ever formed so great an anomaly in the hierarchical system. It interposed between the Holy See and the Bishops, and between the Bishops and their flocks. It interrupted the connection between the religious orders and their generals in Rome, so that they degenerated, and came, in the eighteenth century, to be less respected than the secular clergy. In the sphere of doctrine its action was not more beneficial than in the domain of government. It has long been usual to palliate its many defects by saying that at least it saved Spain from heresy, and from the calamities of religious war. This is not true, and it is doubtful praise if it were true. If there had been any Protestant tendencies in Spain, there would have been some symptoms of opposition and resistance to the tribunal which was particularly vigilant against heresy. But instead of that, it was always a popular institution. Moreover, the control exercised over theological and historical literature would have made it impossible to meet Protestantism in open combat and controversy. But there never was any serious danger from

* Louville, who was in Spain at the time of the accession of the Bourbons, speaks of the Inquisition as "toujours en guerre, au dehors avec le pape, au dedans avec les sujets" (*Mémoires secrets*, 1818, i. 69).

† This is one of Ranke's most remarkable works. Mr. Prescott thought so highly of it, that he caused a few copies of the translation to be printed in large type, for his own private use.

Protestantism which would not have been encountered with as much success if there had been no Inquisition. The recent history of Spain, as of Italy, makes it doubtful whether it is greatly for the advantage of a Catholic nation that it escaped the ordeal of the Reformation; whether to prevent a crisis is not to make the action of the poison more prolonged and more insidious, to convert an acute into a chronic disease, and make it impossible to overcome and cast out the danger. The means taken to resist Protestantism opened the way for infidelity. The Inquisition tried to prevent a conflict, not to prepare for it; and this policy, which was successful so long as a conflict could be avoided, made resistance almost impossible when it became necessary. The postponement of the religious controversy in Spain from the Protestant to the infidel period, rendered it in every way more difficult and more dangerous. That is not due to the Inquisition alone; but the Inquisition is responsible for the means which were employed for the purpose.

Of these the most efficacious and the most injurious was the system of intellectual repression. Not only was the Spanish Index far more comprehensive than the Roman, but it was conducted on a different principle. The Roman practice was, to point out the danger, and to caution men against it. The denunciation presupposed the intellectual confutation of the error, and was based upon it. It was understood that there was a class of learned men whose business it was to take cognisance, in the interest of orthodoxy, of the literary movement of the age, and to profit alike by its good and bad elements, whilst the generality of the faithful were excluded from this arena. Thus it was imagined that religion would have all the advantages both of security and of controversial exercise. But in Spain the dread of error was so great that it led to a fear of all mental activity. Literature was sacrificed to religion. Because faith might be imperilled by science, science was proscribed; and a system of stagnation was introduced, by which the Church was deprived of the aid which literature affords to her. The greatest severity was exercised upon every branch of ecclesiastical learning. The Spanish intellect, it is true, is not remarkable for versatility or comprehensiveness. There are departments for which Spaniards have never exhibited the smallest aptitude. When we speak of Spanish literature, we think generally of great poets like Cervantes and Calderon, or of great divines like those who did so much of the work of the Council of Trent. But at the revival of letters, it had seemed for a moment that Spain was to rival Italy on a far

wider field. Of the Oriental studies of Alcalà we hear something in the *Life of Ximenes*. Ancient learning had brilliant representatives in Vives and Augustinus. Throughout the sixteenth century there were great scholastic divines, and great mystical writers; and the Spanish historians, from Zurita to Mariana, rivalled the Florentines. But all this splendid promise faded quickly away; and when in Italy, France, and England, learning began to be more sound and literature more rich, in Spain they were already nearly extinct. After the beginning of the seventeenth century no great works appeared on ecclesiastical or pagan antiquities, on metaphysics or natural science. Even those branches of divinity which had most flourished in Spain, flourished but a short time. No history was cultivated but their own. In philosophy, antiquities, and natural science, Spain has the lowest place among the great nations of Europe. All this destruction the Inquisition wrought in a very short space. For the first half century it had little to do with literature, and literature accordingly flourished. Its attention began to be given to it when the Reformation called for some measures of resistance. Between the middle of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, during the reigns of Philip II. and Philip III., the whole intellectual movement of Spain was entirely crushed. Each branch of letters suffered in proportion as it was most nearly allied with religion, and most capable of serving it. Nothing survived intact but poetry and romance.

This is the great injury that the Inquisition inflicted on religion. It deprived her of the intellectual and literary service of the Spanish people; yet in the face of the most obvious and conspicuous fact of modern history, writers are still found who deny that the Inquisition was injurious to literature. Because there were many great writers after its establishment, it is argued that it cannot have been hostile to the progress of intellect. Hefele has written upon this point a sentence marvellously foolish: "Llorente, it is true, enumerates 118 learned men who were prosecuted by the Inquisition, but omits adding that they escaped without personal injury" (p. 365). By this we are to understand that a scholar is not interrupted in his studies until he is burnt at an *auto da fé*. The *post hoc ergo propter hoc* argument which is used to defend the literary merits of the Inquisition may be applied just as well to the political career of the Habsburgs in Spain. They no sooner ascended the throne, in the person of the Emperor Charles V., than the monarchy became the most powerful in the world, and retained its su-

premacv for near 100 years. It is therefore idle to say that the Habsburg dynasty can have had any part in the decline of Spain during the last century of its rule.

In the attempt to glorify the Inquisition in departments in which it was an unmitigated evil, its really great merit has been generally overlooked. It was a true and effective guardian of the morality of the people. Acting as a sort of religious police, it succeeded in eradicating certain vices and certain crimes. The mediæval wars had developed among the Spaniards of the fifteenth century a barbarous ferocity, and all the evil effects of continued warfare. The Inquisition was the instrument by which greater humanity, morality, and subordination were restored. It was the only disguise in which the Spaniards would submit to the interference of a state police.

This, again, leads us to the second great mischief of the Inquisition, next to the repression of religious thought. It was the religious mask, by means of which absolutism was imperceptibly introduced; for crimes against the State were subject to its jurisdiction as much as crimes against religion. Those, for instance, who exported horses to France in time of war came before its tribunals. It defended the authority of the crown against the nobility and against the Church with as much energy as the purity of faith and morals. But it is due to the Inquisition to admit, that if it was instrumental in establishing despotism in Spain, it likewise saved the people from being degraded by it, and greatly mitigated its oppressiveness. The severity of its procedure, the 20,000 criminals who suffered death during the 300 years of its activity, are the picturesque details which strike the imaginations of men, excite their passions, and conceal from them the serious features of its character, and the real part it has performed in history. It did more than any other thing for the ruin of Church and State in Spain, by promoting political despotism and intellectual stagnation.

THE NEGRO RACE AND ITS DESTINY.*

THE scholars of Germany continue to handle the most extensive and intricate investigations with a fullness of erudition

* *Anthropologie der Naturvölker.* Von Dr. Theodor Waitz. Leipzig, 1860.

which leaves the learned of other nations far behind. Philosophy, history, literature, philology,—over all these fields they have swept, and gathered in abundant harvests; and now, being almost in the predicament of Alexander, and lacking new worlds to conquer, they enter the boundless and trackless plains of *Anthropology*. To us sciolists of Britain the very name has as yet hardly a familiar sound; and as for the thing signified, although our countrymen are unsurpassed in the energy with which they contribute to the stock of raw material, the process of scientific working up has scarcely been seriously attempted amongst us. This latter enterprise is being taken in hand by the Germans, and, if we may judge by the work before us, in the very best manner. Unlike their celebrated countryman, who, when requested to write an essay on “the Camel,” is said to have retired within himself, and evolved the ground-idea of that animal “out of the depths of his moral consciousness,” the present race of philosophers, when describing any people, ransack all literatures for fact-evidence, indicate to the reader with the utmost exactness the sources from which their statements are derived, or on which their theories are founded, and sift the evidence which they have collected, or seem to do so, with a grand judicial impartiality.

To this school of writers belongs the author whose latest production we are to examine to-day. Dr. Theodor Waitz, professor of philosophy at Marburg, is bringing out a series of works on the “*Anthropology of the uncivilised peoples*,” of which the first was devoted to a general survey of the subject, while the second treats of “the Negro peoples and their kindred.” The first work we have not seen; of the second we can speak warmly in praise. Though rugged and unattractive in point of style, it possesses the far higher merits of philosophical method, thoroughness of investigation, and clearness of statement. A catalogue of more than two hundred and fifty separate works, with dates and editions carefully specified, is given at the outset, as forming the “literature” of the subject. The history and actual condition of the Negro race, both as it exists in its native seats, and as it appears after transplantation to European colonies and long residence there under new conditions, are then carefully described. Nowhere is there any hasty theorising; nowhere is a bias perceptible towards any one system or group of opinions rather than another. The only occasions on which there is any sign of our author’s feelings being at all enlisted (and the emotion does him honour) are when he has to notice the statements and reasonings of that class of writers, principally

American, who dishonour God and disgrace their own manhood by asserting that the Negroes are morally and intellectually nearer on a level with the ape than with the white man. Dr. Waitz does not understand that "those who have put out the people's eyes" should now "reproach them with their blindness;"* that those who have kept the Negro for many generations not in slavery merely, but in a hopeless, abject, stationary slavery, tending to destroy all the higher qualities of manhood,—who, instead of training them up through servitude to freedom, have gone on deliberately breeding them like cattle for the market,—should point to the miserable result of their own crimes as a justification of their unfavourable estimate of the Negro character.

Taking Dr. Waitz for our chief guide, but using, as occasion serves, other collateral evidence, a portion of which has escaped his observation, we proceed to give a summary account of this ill-used race under the following heads:

1. Ethnographical distribution and history.
2. Physical geography of its abode.
3. Conditions of life.
4. Physiological characteristics.
5. Character and intelligence.
6. Family life.
7. Political institutions.
8. Religion.

So far the inquiry will be confined to the Negro in Africa. Crossing the ocean, the observer must then follow him to his new domiciles among the colonial communities, and notice the amount and kind of divergence from the original type which the differing circumstances of those communities have produced. By this means the reader will, it is hoped, be in a position to answer for himself with tolerable confidence certain questions which every lover of his species, and particularly every friend of the African, must have often anxiously put to himself. Such questions are: Whence comes it,—from Divine decree, or great constitutional inferiority, or from some other cause or causes,—that this race is, and always has been, so easily reduced to slavery? How stand the prospects of its future elevation in the scale of humanity, or is it inaccessible to culture, and incapable of progress? Lastly, what is the ideal social state to which the friends of the race should aim at raising it?

Ethnographical and historical.—The Negroes must be carefully distinguished from the aboriginal Berbers and Copts,

* Milton's *Apology for Smectymnuus*.

from the intrusive Arabs, and from the tribes of Abyssinia (Bischarya, Gallas, and Nubians). They are also essentially a different race from the Malagasy of Madagascar. Still more marked is the distinction between them and the Fulahs, though the latter are geographically so much intermingled with them. We approach a step nearer to the Negro type when we come to the Congo tribes and the Caffers, who occupy the whole of Africa south of the Line, with the exception of the Hottentot territory. The Hottentots, again, present a type which is a peculiar exaggeration of that of the Negro, and blends with it other features; their language also is wholly different. The true seat of the Negro race at present is a strip of country of from ten to twelve degrees wide, bounded to the north by a line carried from the Senegal to Timbuktu, and from thence north of Lake Tsad to Sennaar on the Blue Nile. As, however, the population of the eastern portion of this region (Darfur, Kordofan, Wadai) is largely composed of other than Negro elements, it may be said that Negroland proper consists of Senegambia, the basin of the Niger, and the basin of Lake Tsad.

The race was probably much more widely spread in former times. Though never the aboriginal population in Egypt (where Negro slaves are unmistakably depicted on some of the oldest monuments), there is reason to believe that they were so in Abyssinia, and that they inhabited the whole breadth of the continent far to the south of their present seats. On the north, it is probable that they once occupied great part of the habitable country between the Desert and the Mediterranean, from which they were dispossessed and driven southwards by the Berbers; for there are several isolated black, or partly black, communities—Negro islands, so to speak (*e.g.* Tuggurt, Tauat, Ghat, and in Fezzan)—scattered over the Great Desert and the countries north of it, like ruined fragments surviving a general denudation.

From the earliest times Negroes appear to have been led away as slaves into other lands: they are so represented, as was said before, on the Egyptian monuments; and, as far back as historical records extend, we find them carried into slavery in Arabia, Persia, and even the Malayan peninsula. At this day, the Mohammedan kingdoms bordering upon Negroland are incessantly sending out Negro-hunting expeditions, in order to provide themselves with slaves. Lastly, it is unnecessary to say that a large portion of the population of America consists of Negro slaves.

The two most noticeable facts in the history of the Negro race are, the Arabic invasion and the European slave-trade.

By the first the Negroes have come within the circle of Mohammedan, by the second within that of Christian influences. It is probable that, even before the rise of Islam, Arabs penetrated into Soudan; but however this may be, it is certain that, from the eleventh century onwards, Arab races have made extensive and permanent settlements in inner Africa, and that it was first about that time* that Islam penetrated like a wedge the great Negro kingdoms (Songhay, Bourb-y-Jolof, Bornu, &c.), and shattered them to pieces. It is singular, but most certain, that the Arabs did not press upon Negroland from the east, as might have been expected, but from the north and west. After having overwhelmed the whole northern coast of Africa, and established a flourishing empire in Morocco, they turned from thence southwards, and penetrated into Senegambia. Hence the western Negro tribes, the Mandingos, Jolofs, &c. were the first to embrace the Koran; and from them the religion was propagated eastward and southward. At the present day, the Mandingos have cooled down from their first fervours, and their Mohammedanism is said to be of a merely conventional nature. Other peoples, however, evince no lack of zeal. The Fulahs are at this day (Barth, *passim*) most fanatical and active propagators of the religion of the false prophet, and Islam is still constantly receiving considerable accessions by the conversion of heathen tribes.

The intercourse between the Negroes and Europeans commenced with ill-doing on the part of the latter. About the year 1442, we read of slaves having been brought by Portuguese ships from the western coast to Portugal. Early in the sixteenth century, even before the humane but ill-judged proposal of Las Casas, in 1517, Negroes had been taken to the Spanish West Indies. Upon the establishment of the great trading companies in England, France, and Holland, in the seventeenth century, the slave-trade received an immense expansion. The first Negroes were landed in Virginia in 1620, in New England in 1639. The continuance of the trade was, as all the world knows, forced upon the colonies by the mother country up to the period of the War of Independence. The slave-trade was abolished by England in 1807, by France in 1819, by Spain (nominally) in 1820, by the

* It was in 1009 (p. 18) that the first ruler of the Songhay empire was converted to Islam. Sixty years later we hear of Mohammedanism and Paganism as subsisting side by side in Gana. In 1350, according to Ibn Batuta, in the Mandingo kingdom of Melle, Islam was incontestably in the ascendant. The kingdoms of Wadai, Darfur, and Kordofan became Mohammedan only in the seventeenth century. Into Loggun Islam penetrated only sixty years ago.

United States in 1807, and by Brazil in 1850. Since the abolition of the slave-trade, the legitimate commerce of Great Britain with Western Africa has enormously increased.

Physical Geography.—Under this one head no information will be found in Dr. Waitz's volume, which seems singular, when we consider the undoubted influence which climate and soil exercise on human development. Scattered over the five thick volumes of Dr. Barth (to mention no other source), the curious reader may find ample notices on this subject. The following sketch may here suffice. Negro-land, or Soudan, is, speaking generally, a vast tract of flat or undulating country, having but a slight elevation above the sea. It is watered by countless streams, which in the hot season are mostly dry, but in and after the rainy season (from June to September) form fertilising inundations, which cover miles of country. In these low, steaming flats vegetation is wonderfully rapid and exuberant; but the air is deadly in its effect upon European constitutions. There are at different points in this wide region lofty single mountains,—as the Cameroons (13,000 feet) opposite Fernando Po, Mount Alantika (9000 feet) in Adamawa, and Mendif (6000 feet) in Musgu,—but there is no continuous mountain chain of great elevation, unless the little-known chain of the Kong Mountains should prove an exception. The Niger, with its stream of 2200 miles, is the grand physical feature of the region. This is the river, “flowing towards the rising sun,” which the Nasamonian youths, adventuring in search of new discoveries from the Libyan coast across the burning Sahara, fell in with more than 2300 years ago, and found a diminutive race of blacks dwelling in cities on its banks. Herodotus (ii. 32) and his informants supposed this river to be the upper Nile; and, strange to say, it is only since the researches of the last thirty years that this error has been entirely exploded, and the non-communication of the two rivers conclusively proved. Lake Tsad, with its broad margin of low alluvial land, in some places twenty miles wide, yearly overflowed during the rainy season, exactly corresponds to the ἑλη μέγιστα—the immense marshes or fens—through which the Nasamonians are said to have been led on their way to the Niger.

Conditions of Life.—These are of two kinds, physical and artificial. As the most influential among those of the first kind, may be named the intense relaxing heat of the climate, and the abundance of cultivable land relatively to population. The first condition, predisposing men to laziness and sensual enjoyment, tempts the powerful to use great exertions to

procure slaves to do their work for them. They could not get it done for hire, any more than the Jamaica planters could after emancipation, because the second condition is continually operative : nature is so bountiful, land so abundant relatively to population, and man in such a climate so disposed to enjoy the present and slight the prospective good, that no one, unless *forced*, would bestow upon the soil any more than the small amount of toil required to raise food enough for his own and his family's subsistence. How should the prospect of hire tempt the free Negro to labour for ten or twelve hours under that burning sun, when he has nothing to do but squat upon a patch of land, on which two or three hours daily toil will amply supply him with food, leaving him the rest of his time for dancing, singing, shouting, gossiping, strutting, and sleeping ?

Among the artificial conditions of life may be named the subdivision of Negroland into so many small states, always at war with one another, always trying to catch slaves on each other's borders ; so that, the tenure of property and life being insecure, no accumulations can be made, and no regular progress in those arts and that culture which attest the civilised man is practicable.

Physiological Type.—There are great variations in stature among the Negro tribes, from the Mangas of Bornu, who are over six feet, to the Betsang of inner Africa, who range from three to five feet high. “The brain is, as well taken absolutely as relatively, that is, in proportion to the nerves proceeding from it, smaller than in the European ; the form of its convolutions less favourable ; they are neither equally numerous nor so advantageously developed.” The middle lobe of the brain is prominently developed, while the anterior lobe is receding. The hind head often projects considerably. “The head appears as if compressed on both sides ; the face as long and small ; its lower part juts out, ‘snout-fashion,’ more than in the European ; and the facial angle often amounts to little more than 70° .” The forehead is small and round ; the eyes long, narrow, and black ; the cheek-bones stand out, and make the face, from which the broad, thick, flat nose, with wide nostrils, rises but little, appear on a full view as if pressed flat. The mouth is wide, and the lips flabby. The ear is rudely shaped. The foot is marked by the length and breadth of the heel, and is flat. The skin is thicker than that of the European ; is cool to the feel ; and its transpiration has a peculiar, unpleasant odour.

This type, however, is, Dr. Waitz admits, “an extreme form.” It must not be supposed that such is generally the

external aspect of man in Negroland. It would be regarded by most Negroes as a caricature. Still this, according to our author, is nearer to the type of the pure, unadulterated Negro breed than any other which can be defined. This, to our notions, unsightly type it is, which, after all Caucasian admixture is abstracted, remains as the distinctive form to which the race tends to approximate.

Character and Intelligence.—The mental calibre of the Negro shows a general conformity, as might be expected, with his inferior physiological type. He is distinguished by a predominance of sensuous perceptivity, and an activity of sensuous fancy, joined to the comparative absence or torpor of the higher intellectual faculties. Such a character causes him to delight in noise and revelry,—to be attracted by the outward shows of things, and little apt to inquire into their hidden relations,—to be fond of gay colours, finery, spectacles of all kinds, loud noises, luscious odours, spicy viands, and sensual indulgence generally. Hence comes his deep reverence for power, if it comes recommended to him by outward pomp. His unbridled fancy leads him to whatever is extravagant and inordinate. His devouring desires easily hurry him into every kind of sensual excess, as well as into enormous crimes. But there are also other traits by which the Negro character is more favourably, and quite as specifically, distinguished. Such are his loyalty to his superiors, the strength of his affections both as parent and as child, his general kind-heartedness, and the enthusiastic warmth of his religious feelings.

The Negro* is commonly charged with three principal vices,—coarse sensuality, laziness, and unfeeling cruelty. The first is ascribed to him with the most justice, although there are particular tribes to which it is little attributable. As to laziness, Dr. Waitz truly remarks, that it is no peculiarity of the race, but a vice common to all slave populations. We shall presently see in how extended a sense this designation is applicable to the natives of Negroland. Mungo Park† was of opinion that the free Negroes generally were by no means remarkable for laziness. And in Brazil, where just laws enable the slaves to secure their freedom by industry, and afterwards to enjoy all the privileges of freedom and of citizenship, in spite of their colour, travellers‡ testify to innumerable cases of energetic and successful industry on the part of Negroes. At the same time, it must be admitted that, when left to himself, although susceptible of passionate excitement, the Negro does appear incapable of

* p. 206. † Travels, i. 280.

‡ See Kidder and Fletcher, *passim*.

sustained, forecasted, regular exertion. This may arise partly from the effects of climate, partly from natural disposition. As for the third vice laid to his charge, that of cruelty, the Negro certainly has small regard for a human life. Father Peureux, in a letter respecting the superstitions of the Gaboon Negroes,* who inhabit the coast south of Fernando Po, gives some horrible details touching the frequent murders of persons by their own blood-relations, who are impelled by the belief that the relics of such persons, if worn about them, will prove a sovereign preservative against the attacks of their enemies, and ill-fortune of every kind. Nor can the long list of European travellers be forgotten whose valuable lives have been sacrificed to the African's cupidity or caprice. Still he must rather be described as bloodthirsty than as cruel; he kills, but he does not, like the North-American Indian, reserve his victims for future tortures.

But there is a farther assertion, grounded on this charge of cruelty, which is one of those that move our author's bile. It is "that the lot of the African slave in America is, on account of this prevailing feature of cruelty in the Negro character, more desirable than that of the slave in Africa." It is easy to see that this bolt comes from an American quiver; nor is the falsehood of the assertion more transparent than the sinister purpose in making it. Dr. Waitz immediately brings to bear a whole volley of testimony proving the exact contrary. In doing this, he takes occasion to show the enormous extension of slavery in the Negro countries. Park states† that in the Mandingo country (Senegambia) the proportion of slaves to free was as three to one; in the Yoruba country it has been discovered to rise to four to one; but three to one may be taken as the average proportion throughout Negroland, even at the present day. This one fact disposes at once of many philanthropic aspirations. It shows that *the European or American demand for slaves is not responsible for African slavery*, and that, were it totally withdrawn, the state of things would remain the same. Next, Dr. Waitz establishes, by copious citation of authors, the general statement, that "the relations of slaves in Negroland are without doubt far more favourable than in America, and that it is even impossible to treat them so ill in the former as in the latter country." He shows, for instance, that in parts of Western Africa the slaves have two days in the week to themselves, while the house-slaves in Nuffi have half their time at their own disposal; that among the Jolofs, they seldom beat their slaves, eat out of the same dish with

* Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, Jan. 1860. † Vol. i. 287.

them, and care for their children as if they were their own ; that in Bonny the slave sometimes marries his master's daughter; that in Nuffi (hear it, border-ruffians of Missouri!) the murder of a slave is punished with death, just like any other murder. In short, the general position of slaves in Negroland is not oppressive: it corresponds to the patriarchal organisation of society which prevails there ; and it abundantly proves the possession by the Negroes of that natural kind-heartedness which we before stated to be a national characteristic. In connection with this subject, some touching stories in Park's Travels will be remembered, as well as his general statement that he had never met with a single Negro woman from whom he had not experienced the kindest and tenderest treatment.

With regard to honesty, the general rule is, that it varies in the inverse ratio of the Negro's intercourse with Europeans. Theft is always a common vice with slaves ; yet an Englishman who was overseer on a plantation in Cuba* thinks, that "almost the worst thief among them, if appointed to a responsible situation, where he should see confidence reposed in him by his master, would not lightly break it."

With regard to the natural intellectual endowments of the Negro, Dr. Waitz takes on the whole a favourable view. While admitting that in his own country, and apart from all foreign influence, his intellectual achievements have been and are extremely small, and that his capacity for sustained reflection and abstract thought seems to be deficient, he points to a variety of facts which prove that, at least in all the lower intellectual powers, the Negro is as well, perhaps better, furnished than the European. For instance, he has a remarkably retentive memory ; so much so, that in the schools of Protestant missions Negro children "often outstrip their white school-fellows in development, and only fall behind them about the twelfth year, when the faculty of reflection begins to take the upper hand." Even this deficiency of reflection, Waitz thinks, may be an effect of climate and social relations, and therefore remediable. Again, he exhibits extreme acuteness and expertness in his business dealings with Europeans ; and shows in this relation great power of estimating character, and of modifying his behaviour accordingly. The race also produces great men, *e.g.* the king of Sulimana, mentioned by Laing, and the chief of Timneh, by Clarke ; a proof in itself that it is capable of that progressive elevation by culture which is ordinarily worked out by the action of extraordinary minds. On the whole,

* Taylor's United States and Cuba, 1851.

while allowing that philanthropists have exaggerated the capacity of the Negro, Dr. Waitz energetically condemns the interested judgment passed by some Americans, which would place him hardly on a higher level than the ape, allowing him the imitative faculties, but denying to him the capability of true culture.

Family Life.—It is when we unfold this chapter of the natural history of the Negro, that we begin to comprehend the deep moral debasement into which paganism plunges the fallen nature of man. The reader of Dr. Waitz will stand aghast at the disclosure, guaranteed by numerous unimpeachable witnesses, of the frightful impurity which surrounds the intercourse between the sexes in Negroland, and of the consequent degradation of women. Writing for general readers, we can give but faint and far-off touches of a state of things which is enough to move a true Christian heart to tears of blood.

The patriarchal organisation of society, while, as we said, it implies mild treatment of the slave, implies also that all the subordinate members of the family are more or less in a servile condition with reference to its head. This state of things, which Sir Robert Filmer thought so delightful as to declare it to be the natural and only desirable relation between ruler and subject, involves in Negroland consequences which would perhaps have staggered even the author of the "Patriarcha." A man's wife, or wives, being his *quasi* slaves, are regarded by him as articles of property, and as subject to the incidents of ownership. Hence, not only is the wife purchased to begin with (a custom not altogether confined to Negroland), but she is exchanged, lent, prostituted, and transferred by her husband just like any other chattel. Sometimes even a wife is taken on trial, or for a limited time. Conjugal infidelity is not regarded by the husband as an attack on his honour, but as an infringement of his rights of property, and can therefore generally be compounded for by fine.* Similarly, it is not uncommon for the head of the family to sell his own blood-relations, who being born in his house are his slaves, into slavery abroad. It seems, however,† that this is seldom done except under the severest pressure, and that intercourse with Europeans and dram-drinking are the usual incentives.

Polygamy is an obvious and almost universal feature of Negro family life. Poverty of course compels great numbers of free negroes to be content with one wife,—a piece of mortification which for the same reason is practised by

* p. 114.

† p. 124.

many Turks; but the only people, according to Dr. Waitz,* who are monogamists on principle are the Banjuns, who were converted to Catholicity long ago by the Portuguese. The inherent evils of polygamy seem to be somewhat lessened by the circumstance, — general throughout Negroland, — that there is one head wife, the *δέσποινα* of the household, to whom all the others are subordinate. Chastity before marriage is held in little or no account. As of old among the Hebrews, it is the deepest reproach to Negro wives to be childless, and, like Rachel and Leah, they often treat the children by their husbands of their female slaves as their own. Deformed children and twins are frequently made away with as soon as born. Divorce is easily obtainable, even by the wife; neglect or ill-usage is sufficient to justify it. Of the worse than phallic rites and abominable practices which take place among the young of both sexes, it is impossible here to speak.

Yet as some relief to this dark picture, it is a satisfaction to record that instances† are not absolutely wanting of even romantic conjugal love; that respect and solicitude are almost universally shown by youth to age; and that nothing can exceed the deep *pietas* with which the Negro regards his mother. Park noticed this long ago, and all subsequent travellers corroborate his statement.

Religion.—Before speaking of the different degrees in which religions introduced from abroad have extended themselves among the Negro race, it will be proper to give a short account of the *religio loci*. At the very outset one startling fact meets us. It has been assumed by philosophers that the original religion of the Negro is Fetishism, and Comte in his Positive Philosophy‡ uses the supposed fact to ground upon it his theory of the development of religious doctrine, by the operation of natural law, from Fetishism through the successive stages of Polytheism and Monotheism into Positivism, *i. e.* Atheism. But the truth is, not only that at the present day Monotheism coexists with Fetishism throughout the pagan Negro tribes from the Gambia to Loango, where not the slightest suspicion of the influence of Mohammedanism can be entertained, but also that traces are not wanting§ of the prevalence of a purer Theism in ancient times than can now be met with. Over the whole tract of country above referred to, the natives believe in a Supreme Good Being as the creator and sovereign ruler of the world. Rupi, Olorun, Mawu, Tschuku,—are among the various names by which

* p. 108.

† Martineau's Abridgment, ii. 186.

‡ p. 116.

§ p. 171.

this Supreme Being is designated. It is true, that just as in China the ordinary name for God signifies also the firmament of heaven,* so in Negroland all these names for the Deity signify also some part or power of the material creation, as the sun, the rain, the sky, or the lightning. But the Yebust† are said to possess a still purer worship. They address to the unseen Creator, whom they call "the King of Heaven," such petitions as these,—“God in heaven, protect me from sickness and death;” “God, give me good fortune and wisdom.” Nor does this belief in a Supreme God invariably remain a mere barren opinion. The Negro is said‡ often to console himself in misfortune with such ejaculations as, “God looks on me;” “I am in God’s hand,” &c.

Yet, on the other hand, it is too true that a barbarous, systemless, idolatrous superstition far overbalances in the Negro’s consciousness these purer conceptions. Though believing in a Creator, he seldom thinks it worth while to invoke Him, partly because, like the Epicurean, he imagines him “*securum agere ævum*,” and to be unconcerned by the petty affairs of mortals, partly because he conceives the whole of nature to be instinct with supernatural life and power, to be peopled with spirits active for good or evil; and hence, that whatever time or thought he can spare for religion should in reason be devoted to gaining their patronage, or disarming their hostility. Hence arises Fetish-worship. “According to the view of the Negro, a spirit resides, or may reside, in every sensuous object, and often a very great and powerful one occupies an object that is quite unsightly. He conceives of this spirit, not as firmly and unalterably joined to the corporeal thing in which it dwells, but only as having its ordinary or principal abode therein.” Sometimes he distinguishes the spirit from the tenement which it informs; “but the more common case is, that he mentally groups together the two, as forming one whole, and this whole is (as Europeans name it) ‘the Fetish,’ the object of his religious worship.” Like most idolatrous peoples, he does not unravel his religious ideas, or reduce them to a logical order. “His Fetish is to him a god, and at the same time a mere idol, a block of wood; he is the god himself and that which is consecrated to the god or possessed by him,—a tree, an animal, a vessel, a sacrifice, an altar, an inspired priest or seer, a temple;—he is the god himself, and that which is endowed by him with miraculous power,—a medicine, an amulet, a lucky or unlucky day, a forbidden food, a poison.”

It need scarcely be added to this description, that there

* Tien.

† p. 169.

‡ p. 173.

is hardly any connection between the practical religion of the Negro and the principles of morality. He believes that what the gods punish in the next world is not murder, theft, or adultery, but the non-observance of festivals, the neglect of prescribed abstinences, and similar ceremonial shortcomings. But to describe the various monstrous, absurd, or revolting developments of this Fetish superstition would require a volume. The letter of Father Peureux above quoted particularises a few of the most cruel and unnatural. St. Paul's account* of the moral condition of the Gentile world in his day may be literally applied in almost every particular to the state of Negroland now; of which many dark and atrocious inventions of the devil stand recorded that are not noticed in the fearful catalogue of the Apostle.

But a large proportion—the means of ascertaining it with even an approach to exactness do not exist—of the inhabitants of Negroland are now the adherents of religions of foreign introduction. Of these the vast majority profess Islam, to which, as before noticed, the western and northern Negro countries—Senegambia, Borgu, Haussa, Kanem, Bornu, Baghirmi—have all been converted, and which is still making constant advances among the tribes to the south and east. That the pagan Negro is on the whole a gainer by conversion to Islam seems undeniable. Dr. Waitz thinks that the gain is absolutely unqualified; but to this the attentive readers of Barth, a thoroughly impartial witness, are likely to demur. If many devils are cast out, there are some that retain their hold, and some evil germs are introduced which were unknown before. The Mohammedan Negro no longer offers human sacrifices; he is no longer under the thralldom of the brutalising superstitions, which plunged him in his pagan days into unnumbered follies and cruelties; he rises to the notion of self-respect, and has more of the dignity of man;—he worships one only God, the creator and ruler of the universe; he learns to have a regard for truth; he comes under the influence of a literature, and rejoices in the participation of a great tradition. On the other hand, his conversion to Islam generally inspires him with an inordinate pride, to which he was before a stranger;—it very frequently leads to his assuming the odious character of a Tartuffe, or religious hypocrite; it seems to increase his cupidity, and from being a simple slave-holder, too often transforms him into an inveterate slave hunter and trader; it imposes little restraint on his cruelty, and none at all on his sensuality. Polygamy, that bane of social life, the existence of which

* Rom. i.

precludes the advance of a people in true culture, is sanctioned both by the precept and the example of the Prophet.

We have now to speak of the degree in which the Negro race has been influenced by Christianity. Dr. Waitz seems to think that conversion to Islam is calculated to benefit the race in a higher degree than conversion to Christianity, and that the religion of Europeans, as such, must be less suitable for the Negro than that of the Arabs, from whom he differs so far less widely. But he forgets that the religion of Christ is of Asiatic, not of European, origin; that it arose in that border-land which is the point of junction of the three continents—Europe, Asia, and Africa,—as if to show its equal suitability to all three; and that the Ethiopian minister of Queen Candace was among the earliest converts of the apostolic age. It is, indeed, unhappily true, that the enormities practised by European slave-dealers cannot but have alienated the Negro from the religion which such men professed, and of which he saw no other representatives. But that, when Christianity is presented to him under more favourable circumstances, the Negro readily and heartily embraces it, the evidence which we shall bring will clearly establish.

In Africa, indeed, Christianity has as yet made little way with him. We will speak first of the Protestant missions. The chief centres of these are Sierra Leone, Yoruba, and the Niger. Sierra Leone, having been for years the port at which the slave cargoes rescued by the British cruisers are set at liberty, has a large free black population, the capital, Freetown, containing 40,000 souls. Of these certainly a large proportion adhere to one or other of the Protestant sects. The Wesleyans in 1859 had thirty chapels in Freetown, and numbered their congregations at more than 13,000. The Church Missionary Society claims 3693 “communicants,” which implies perhaps 7000 or 8000 as the total number of their congregations. But a more promising field appears to be Yoruba, in which the principal station, Abeokuta, is the head-quarters of an energetic and excellent man, Mr. S. Crowther, a Negro clergyman. Mainly by Mr. Crowther’s exertions missions have been lately established at three different points on the Niger, Rabba, Onitsha, and Ghebe, at the confluence of the Niger and Tsadda. At present, however, the impression made on heathenism is not great in itself, and the obstacles are many. Mr. Hinderer,* cautioning the Society against being too sanguine, writes, that “the converts are but as yet as two or three in a hundred, and much domestic persecution still exists, and the

* Abstract of Report of Church Missionary Society, May 1860.

idolatrous priesthood are intriguing, and the Mohammedan tribes are alarmed," &c. The Niger missions are as yet quite in their infancy.

We have not the materials at hand for presenting a complete picture of the state of the Catholic missions. The chief centres are, the Senegal, Sierra Leone, the Gaboon River, and Fernando Po. From the Senegal, where there is a Bishop, Christianity must have made its influence strongly felt, since we learn* that the temporary marriages which had been common among the neighbouring tribes have in consequence of that influence been discontinued. But of the number of converts we possess no information. In 1858, a society for preaching the Gospel in Western Africa was formed at Lyons, through the exertions of Mgr. de Marion Bressillac, to whom the Holy See confided, as Vicar-Apostolic, the districts of Sierra Leone and Liberia. Unhappily, this zealous prelate, with several of his clergy, fell a victim to a pestilence which broke out at Sierra Leone some months after his landing there, and we are not aware of a successor having been as yet appointed. It is announced, however,† that the mission of Sierra Leone has been recently committed by the Holy See to the English province of the Society of Jesus. A flourishing mission has been in existence for some years at the Gaboon River; but the Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, which tell us so much, are sparing of statistics. Of what has been effected at Fernando Po since the revival of Spanish rule there, we have no precise information.

In America the Negro, as might be expected, generally follows the religion of his master, and professes Christianity. Only the Mina Negroes in Brazil‡ are spoken of as still remaining Mohammedans. That this external assumption of Christianity is very generally found to coexist with an almost total disregard of morality, is very true, and, if the circumstances are minutely weighed, not very astonishing. But if it can be shown that the exhibition of apostolic charity, zeal, and patience on the part of his evangelizers has been often rewarded by a flourishing growth of all Christian virtues on the part of the Negro, then Dr. Waitz's opinion of the superior suitability of the Mussulman creed to the Negro character must fall to the ground. Then the only prayer of the Christian must be, that God would once again send forth worthy labourers into this ample harvest. Then the chief aim of all his active efforts to benefit the Negro race must be, to pave the way for the ambassadors of Christ; to do what in him lies to

* Waitz, p. 261.

† Catholic Directory, 1860.

‡ Kidder and Fletcher, p. 136.

hasten the advent, and to forward the work, of such men as St. Peter Claver, whose wonderful apostleship among the Negroes bore, as we shall presently see, such prodigious fruit to heaven.

According to Olmsted,* an intelligent and impartial authority, but a small proportion of the slaves in Virginia profess Christianity at all. Those who do, attach themselves to one or other of the various Protestant sects. The system of the Baptists has an especial attraction for them; there is a thoroughness in the practice of "immersion" which strikes their fancy. But the general testimony in Virginia is to the effect that the "profession" of religion by the Negro is seldom attended by moral improvement. Some go so far as to assert† that the majority of the "professors" are great scoundrels. Olmsted was informed‡ that, dancing having been "preached against," the slaves had lately taken to gambling and worse practices. In South Carolina and Georgia§ the Negroes, whose love of religious excitement is a part of their character, are always having "revivals," which they conduct with all the noise and racket imaginable. The free blacks, taken as a class,|| are said to be not less, if not even more, morally degraded than the slaves. Indeed it would seem that, among the whole labouring population of the Southern States, white as well as black (leaving out of consideration the Irish and Germans), the profession of Protestantism has come to be quite disconnected from the practice of morality. According to Olmsted,¶ the lowest, most ignorant Mexican peon does not stand so low in the scale of man as the degraded "poor white" of South Carolina. Such are among the fruits of the iniquitous slave system of the United States.

From the English West-Indian Islands the accounts which reach us of the religious state of the Negroes are far more cheerful. We hear of their subscribing large sums to missionary societies at home, and of their supporting their ministers (the Wesleyans, we believe, are the favourite sect) with enthusiastic liberality.

Of the religious state of the Negroes whose lot has fallen among Catholic races, we shall have to speak incidentally, when we come to the consideration of the position of the Negro in the various colonial communities. At present our purpose is to show how the greatest preacher and teacher who ever laboured amongst them dealt with the peculiar

* Southern Slave States, 1856, p. 113.

† Ibid.

‡ p. 128.

|| pp. 99, 129, 132.

§ p. 450.

¶ p. 509.

conditions of the problem, and in what degree he was successful.

Peter Claver, a lay brother of the Society of Jesus, arrived in Carthagena, then the principal emporium of Spanish trade in South America, in the year 1610.* His sympathies were immediately aroused for the poor Negroes, cargoes of whom were continually arriving in the port; and after his ordination in 1615, he "devoted himself entirely and for ever to their service." For forty years, until his death in 1655, he never for one day flagged in his devotion to the cause, and during all that time made himself literally "the slave of the slaves."

His practice was this: as soon as a slave-ship arrived at Carthagena, he went on board attended by his interpreters, and carrying on his back a bag containing biscuits, flasks of brandy, and other little delicacies fit for the solace of sick persons. On arriving on board, his first care was for the sick. For these he immediately procured all the alleviation of their sufferings which the cases admitted of; distributing among them the creature comforts which he had brought, and administering such sacraments as they were in a condition to receive. Then collecting together those who were in health, he "erected an altar, on which he placed pictures suited to give those uncultivated minds some idea of the mysteries of religion." The most conspicuous of these was a very striking picture representing Christ upon the cross. He next ascertained by careful inquiry which of the Negroes, if any, had been already baptised. He then expounded to them one by one, in few but distinct words, which were translated by the interpreters, the principal mysteries of religion; and the burning charity which glowed in his face and trembled in his voice, was yet more persuasive than the words themselves. After the explanation of each mystery, he instructed his hearers to make an act of faith in it. To make them more fully understand the regenerating efficacy of baptism, he would say, "'My children, we must be like the serpent, which throws off its old skin to receive another more beautiful and brilliant;' and then drew his nails across his hands, as if he would tear off the skin. The poor slaves, watchful of his slightest motions, did the same, to show him that they understood his meaning." When he thought them sufficiently instructed, he appointed a day for their baptism. He had the greatest trouble with the Negroes from Guinea, who, besides being naturally proud and unyielding, were more or less imbued with Mohammedanism. But he never gave up or despaired; and his apostolic fervour and ineffable charity

* See the Oratorian Life (Richardson, 1849).

bent at last the most stubborn will. After the ceremony of baptism, he would make them an address, in which he exhorted them to "observe faithfully the law of Jesus Christ, whose members they had become, and to die rather than violate it by a single sin; adding, that if unfortunately they should commit any, they would find a salutary remedy, a secure and ever-open resource, in contrition and confession; after which he explained to them the way in which Christians should receive the sacrament of penance."

But Father Claver was not satisfied with making his Negroes Christians; he would have them good and virtuous Christians. How watchful, patient, firm, ingenious, indefatigable he was, in order to gain his point, our limits do not permit us to portray. He daily went his rounds among their huts and barracks, never forgetting to cater for their bodily enjoyment in all things lawful (for he well knew the Negro character), but sternly repressing any thing like vice. He did not "preach against" but encouraged dancing among them, knowing how great a relief and recreation it was to frames over-burdened by toil; but at the least symptom of indelicacy he interfered and broke up the amusement. He never passed a Negro in the street without some words of admonition suitable to his age or to what he knew of his character. He passed whole days in the confessional, particularly during Lent, regardless of the intense heat and of the overpowering smell of the Negroes who crowded round him; and as long as there were any Negroes waiting, he would hear the confession of no white person. "Credible persons who observed him have declared that during one Lent he confessed more than five thousand Negroes."

How did the Negroes receive and profit by the Christianity so recommended to them? "Wherever they met with him," after their baptism, "they always showed the same demonstrations of love and respect. They ran in crowds to meet him, and prostrating themselves on the ground, called him their master, their protector, their father; never thinking they did enough to express their gratitude." His admonitions, we are told, "were usually effectual: fear of God's chastisements sufficed to maintain in virtue, or withdraw from vice, many of those savages who had been till then insensible to every thing else. Moreover, the authority he had gained over their minds, and their affection for him, made them obey without reply or difficulty; the mere sight of him would check the most unruly, and even the vicious, when they met him, knelt down to ask his blessing." The number of Negroes whom he himself in the course of his ministry

brought into the Christian fold was truly astonishing. "A religious questioned him on this subject shortly before he died, to whom he answered, that he thought he had baptised more than three hundred thousand; but as humility always led him to diminish the number of his good works, it has been asserted by persons likely to be well informed, that he had baptised at least four hundred thousand."

Perhaps we have now said enough to enable our readers to judge of the soundness of Dr. Waitz's opinion as to the "unsuitability" of the Christian religion to the Negro character.

In a sequel to this Article (since we have reached, if not exceeded, our limits), we shall proceed to a survey of the present condition of the Negro in America, and conclude with such observations upon the probable or desirable destiny of the race as the results of the entire investigation may seem to justify.

Communicated Articles.

THE ANCIENT SAINTS.

CHAPTER IV.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM.—THE EXILE.

At length our great Confessor has arrived at his appointed place of exile. He reached it faint and exhausted in body and soul; but, as was usual with him, he soon rallied, and began to colour every thing about him with his own sweet, cheerful, thankful temper. In two days he had recovered his equanimity. He was pleased with all that was in any way pleasant; he made the best of what was bad; he blotted out the trials of the past; he fed his imagination with good hopes for the future. He generously and gallantly threw himself upon his lot, and tenderly embraced the cross; and though, as we shall see, the miseries of Cucusus grew on him, in spite of himself, as time went on, still he was determined he would like the place; and he did like it as long as ever he could, and, after the manner of the exiled sovereign in the drama, "found sermons in stones, and good in every thing."

He wrote to Olympias, in letters from which I quoted in the foregoing chapter, that the place promised well; that the climate was like Antioch; that he was too well housed to fear

the winter, and too sure of the winter to fear the Isaurians ; that he had had a hearty welcome on the spot ; that Adelphius, the Bishop, was kind ; that Sopater, the Prefect of Armenia, left nothing undone for his protection ; that friends from Antioch had come over to receive him on his arrival ; and, lastly, that he did not doubt that he should eventually be restored to Constantinople. If the trials of his journey still remained on his memory, it was in order to give a zest to his enjoyment of the repose which had now succeeded to them, and to indispose him to move again. Accordingly, he begged his friends not to attempt to gain from government his transference to any other place, unless, indeed, it was in the immediate neighbourhood of the imperial city. He was happy when he was let alone ; but it was a tremendous penance to travel. Something of all this has already been given in his own words, and more shall now follow :

To Olympias.

“ . . . All these evils have vanished. On arriving at Cucusus, I got rid of all remains of my malady, and I am in most perfect health ; and I am released from my fear of the Isaurians, for there is a strong force of soldiers here who are ready and eager for an engagement ; and there is an abundance of all that is necessary, which flows in upon me on every side, all parties welcoming me with the greatest good-will, in spite of the extreme desolateness of the place. My lord Dioscorus happened to be there ; and he had even sent a domestic to me to Caesarea for the very purpose of inviting, nay begging, me to accept his house and no other ; and many others did the same. I availed myself by preference of his offer, as I felt I ought to do, and took up my abode with him ; and he has been every thing to me, so that I have been continually protesting against the lavish expense which he has been at on my account. He has even left his house to me, and gone to live at some other place, in order to show me every attention possible ; and he got the house into a condition to weather the winter, busying himself with this object in every way. In a word, he has left nothing undone which could be of service to me. Many others too, agents and stewards, have received letters from their masters, ordering them to call upon me, as they have done continually, and in every way to study my comfort.

And now I have told you all about me, the distressing past and the favourable present, lest any friend should be precipitate in getting me removed elsewhere. If these persons, who wish to be kind to me, put into my own hands the choice where to dwell, instead of taking on themselves to assign the place, in that case I accept the favour. But if they remove me hence, in order to send me elsewhere, and there is to be another journey and another exile, this would be far more painful to me than my present condition—

first, because of the chance of my relegation to a more distant or worse country ; next, because travelling is to me worse than ten thousand banishments. For the inconveniences of my late journey brought me to the very gates of death ; and now here I am in Cucusus, recruiting myself by an uninterrupted rest and quiet, and by that quiet nursing my long distress and my shattered bones and wearied flesh.

My lady the Deaconess Sabiniana arrived here the same day that I did, knocked up, indeed, and wearied out, as being of that advanced age when travel is a toil ; but in her earnestness a girl, and making no account of suffering, and ready, as she said, to go as far as Scythia ; for the report went that I was to be deported thither. And now her mind is made up, she says, never to go away again, but to remain wherever I am. The ecclesiastics of the place received her with much attention and kindness. Moreover, my honoured lord, the most religious priest Constantius, would have been here long ago ; for he wrote to me asking my leave to come, because, he said, he would not venture on the step without my judgment, much as he desired it, and certain as it was he could not remain at home ; for he is in hiding, such troubles, he says, are upon him. On this account I beg you not to exert yourself for the change of my abode, for here I am enjoying great relief,—so much so that, in the course of two days, all the troubles of my journey have been wiped out of my mind" (*Ep.* 43).

In a few days he wrote again to the same correspondent, in answer to a letter brought to him by Patricius :

"Why do you bewail me ? Why beat your breast, and abandon yourself to the tyranny of despondency ? Why are you grieved because you have failed in effecting my removal from Cucusus ? Yet, as far as your own part is concerned, you have effected it, since you have left nothing undone in attempting it. Nor have you any reason to grieve for your ill success ; perhaps it has seemed good to God to make my race-course longer that my crown may be brighter. You ought to leap and dance and crown yourself for this, viz. that I should be accounted worthy of so great a matter, which far exceeds my merit. Does my present loneliness distress you ? On the contrary, what can be more pleasant than my sojourn here ? I have quiet, calm, much leisure, excellent health. To be sure, there is no market in the city, nor any thing on sale ; but this does not affect me ; for all things, as if from some fountains, flow in upon me. Here is my lord, the Bishop of the place, and my lord Dioscorus, making it their sole business to make me comfortable. That excellent person Patricius will tell you in what good spirits and lightness of mind, and amid what kind attentions, I am passing my time" (*Ep.* 14).

The same is his report to his friends at Cæsarea, and the same are his expressions of gratitude and affection towards

them. The following is addressed to the President of Cappadocia :

To Carterius.

"Cucusus is a place desolate in the extreme ; however, it does not annoy me so much by its desolateness as it relieves me by its quiet and its leisure. Accordingly, I have found a sort of harbour in this desolateness ; and have sat me down to recover breath after the miseries of the journey, and have availed myself of the quiet to dispose of what remained both of my illness and of the other troubles which I have undergone. I say this to your illustriousness, knowing well the joy you feel in this rest of mine. I can never forget what you did for me in Cæsarea, in quelling those furious and senseless tumults, and striving to the utmost, as far as your powers extended, to place me in security. I give this out publicly wherever I go, feeling the liveliest gratitude to you, my most worshipful lord, for so great solicitude towards me" (*Ep.* 236).

To Hymnetius, who attended him in his illness at Cæsarea, he says : "I shall never give over my praises of you, in all companies, as a worthy man and the best of physicians, and a true friend. Whenever I have to speak here of my illness, of course you come into my story ; and I am necessarily full of the benefits which I experienced from your great skill and kindness, which it is the greatest gratification to myself to enlarge upon." He adds, "Well as I am, I would give a good sum to attract you here, were it only to get the sight of you" (*Ep.* 81). To Firminus, another Cæsarean, he says : "Even to have been in your company once has served to make me love you dearly ; and you are yourself the cause of it, for from the first moment you showed an extreme and enthusiastic affection towards me ; and instead of leaving me to time to gain experience of you, you took me captive at sight, and bound me closely to you. This is why I write to you, and tell you what you are eager to hear. What is that ? Why, that I am in health, that I finished my journey without accident, that I am revelling in perfect quiet and leisure, that I have met with great kindness from all parties, that I am enjoying unspeakable consolation" (*Ep.* 80). And in like manner to Leontius : "From your city I was driven, from my love for you I have not been driven ; for it rested with others whether I should remain there or be cast out, but this thing depends upon me. Nor shall any one avail to deprive me of this privilege ; but whithersoever I am carried, every where I carry with me the honey of my love for you, and revel in the recollection of you" (*Ep.* 83). "I have reached Cucusus in health," he says to Faustinus, "and have found a place free from tumult, full of leisure and quiet,

and without a soul to annoy me or to send me off. Nor is it wonderful that I should have these advantages here, when even the route hither from you, which is so desolate, so dangerous, of such ill repute, was traversed by me without alarms, without adventures, with the enjoyment of greater security than is found in the best-regulated cities" (*Ep.* 84).

While he had this keen sensibility towards the kindnesses done him on his journey, he had no remembrance of the injuries. As to his enemies generally, there is hardly a word against them in the multitude of his private letters which have been preserved. He had spoken of his military attendants with cheerful hopefulness at Nicæa; he speaks of them with satisfaction at Cucusus, though they had shown neither spirit nor generosity at Cæsarea. He was too humble to exact much; he was too resigned not to be content with little. But what is stranger, is his bearing towards Evethius, who seems to have been the tool of his Bishop in frightening the Saint away, on a false alarm, from Seleucia's hospitable villa, and in sending him out in the dark at midnight, with a fever upon him, to stumble among the mountains and to get an overturn in his litter. This priest, indeed, is considered by great authorities to have been, not a Cæsarean, but a friend of the Saint's, who accompanied him from Nicæa. There was such a friend with him at Cucusus certainly; but he seems to me to have joined him at a later date; on the other hand it is certain that Chrysostom knew two persons of the name, and that one of them lived at Cæsarea. Evethius, then, I consider, was one of those priests who had been civil to him up to the time that the Bishop forbade such civility, and who then took part with the Bishop. Chrysostom remembered his beginning rather than his end, as the following letter will show. It will be observed, too, that here, as in a letter I just now quoted, he has forgotten his "alarms and risks," as well as the priest's rough behaviour.

To Evethius.

"Though I am absent from you in body, yet in charity I am bound to your soul; so large a claim of friendship have you deposited with me, in the great attention and kindness which you showed towards me in your own city. Therefore, wherever I go, I never fail to make my acknowledgments to you. And I beg you to write to me frequently, and to give me good tidings about your health. As regards myself, I finished my whole journey without trouble or danger, and am now living at Cucusus, revelling in the quiet and leisure of the place, and enjoying great attention and kindness at the hands of its inhabitants" (*Ep.* 173).

What is a still stronger evidence of his placable spirit, is the tone in which he speaks of the vile Pharetrius himself, in a letter to a friend, who seems to have held some high post at Constantinople, and who had taken a prominent part in defending the Saint from his enemies. Prudence also, it will be observed, dictated this course.

To Pœvanus.

“The matter of Pharetrius is certainly most painful ; however, considering his presbyters have had no dealings with my enemies, as you say, nor have any wish to make common cause with them, but, on the contrary, profess still to be on my side, make no movement against them on this account, though what Pharetrius did to me is unpardonable. However, all his clergy felt pain, and gave open expression to their feeling, and were on my side of the question altogether. Lest, then, we cause a reaction among them, and make them violent, I advise you, after you have heard the whole matter from my soldiers, to keep it to yourself, and to deal with them very gently. I know your discreet ways ; and so say for me that I have heard how much the bishop was distressed at what occurred, and how ready he was to undergo any suffering in order to put right all the flagrant acts which had been committed.

I am in good health, and have shaken off the remains of my illness ; and, when I reflect what anxiety you have shown on this point, it is of itself a medicine to me to have gained so affectionate a friend in you. God reward you for the earnestness, love, zeal, and vigilance which you manifest in my cause, both in this world and in the next : may He defend and guard and protect you, and vouchsafe to you those His secret blessings. And may He grant me to see your dear face soon, and to enjoy your sweet spirit, and thus to hold the best of festivals. For you know well that it is a real festival to me, and a high day, to be allowed your most sweet and profitable converse once again” (*Ep.* 204).

Thus the Saint was ever forgetting his enemies in his friends. And, while it was his gift ever to be making new ones, he did not lose his old. His former people at Antioch vied in their services to him with his partisans at Constantinople and his newly-made acquaintance at Cæsarea. They came to see him, and returned home full of his praises. The enthusiasm which he inspired spread into Syria and Cilicia. Large sums of money were offered him for his support, both at Antioch, and by rich persons in the neighbourhood of Cucusus. One or two letters of this date will serve as a specimen of many.

To Diogenes.

“Cucusus is indeed a desolate spot, and moreover unsafe to dwell in, from the continual danger to which it is exposed of bri-

gands. You, however, though away, have turned it for me into a paradise. For, when I hear of your abundant zeal and charity in my behalf, so genuine and warm (it does not at all escape me, far removed as I am from you), I possess a great treasure and untold wealth in such affection, and feel myself to be dwelling in the safest of cities, by reason of the great gladness which bears me up, and the high consolation which I enjoy" (*Ep.* 144).

Diogenes was one of the friends who sent him supplies : he writes in answer :

"You know very well yourself that I have ever been one of your most warmly attached admirers ; therefore I beg you will not be hurt at my having returned your presents. I have pressed out of them and have quaffed the honour which they did me ; and if I return the things themselves, it has been from no slight or distrust of you, but because I was in no need of them. I have done the same in the case of many others ; for many others too, with a generosity like yours, ardent friends of mine, have made me the same offers ; and the same apology has set me right with them which I now ask you to receive. If I am in want, I will ask these things of you with much freedom, as if they were my own property, nay with more, as the event will show. Receive them back, then, and keep them carefully ; so that, if there is a call for them some time hence, I may reckon on them" (*Ep.* 50).

As a fellow to the above, I add one of his letters

To Carteria.

"What are you saying ? that your unintermitting ailments have hindered you from visiting me ? but you *have* come, you *are* present with me. From your very intention I have gained all this, nor have you any need to excuse yourself in this matter. That warm and true charity of yours, so vigorous, so constant, suffices to make me very happy. What I have ever declared in my letters, I now declare again, that, wherever I may be, though I be transported to a still more desolate place than this, you and your matters I never shall forget. Such pledges of your warm and true charity have you stored up for me, which length of time can never quench nor waste ; but, whether I am near you or far away, ever do I cherish that same charity, being assured of the loyalty and sincerity of your affection for me, which has been my comfort hitherto" (*Ep.* 227).

No one could live in his friends more intimately than St. John Chrysostom ; he had not a monk's spirit of detachment in such severity as to be indifferent to the presence, the handwriting, the doings, the welfare, soul and body, of those who were children of the same grace with him, and heirs of the same promise. He writes as if he considered, that the more religious a man is, the more sensitive he will be of a separation from his friends in religion ; and, by the very topics

which he uses in handling the subject of bereavement, in one of his letters to Olympias, he betrays his own acute suffering under the trial. The passage is too long to quote, but I may attempt an abstract of it.

It is not a light effort, he says (*Ep.* 2), but it demands an energetic soul and a great mind to bear separation from one whom we love in the charity of Christ. Every one knows this who knows what it is to love sincerely, who knows the power of supernatural love. Take the blessed Paul: here was a man who had stripped himself of the flesh, and who went about the world almost with a disembodied soul, who had exterminated from his heart every wild impulse, and who imitated the passionless serenity of the immaterial intelligences, and who stood on high with the Cherubim, and shared with them in their mystical music, and bore prisons, chains, transportations, scourges, stoning, shipwreck, and every form of suffering; yet he, when separated from one soul loved by him in Christian charity, was so confounded and distracted as all at once to rush out of that city, in which he did not find the beloved one whom he expected. "When I was come to Troas," he says, "for the gospel of Christ, and a door was opened to me in the Lord, I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother; but bidding them farewell, I went into Macedonia."

Is it Paul who says this? (he continues;) Paul who, even when fastened in the stocks, when confined in a dungeon, when torn with the bloody scourge, did nevertheless convert and baptise and offer sacrifice, and was chary even of one soul which was seeking salvation? and now, when he has arrived at Troas, and sees the field cleansed of weeds, and ready for the sowing, and the floor full, and ready to his hand, suddenly he flings away the profit, though he came thither expressly for it. "So it was," he answers me, "just so; I was possessed by a predominating tyranny of sorrow, for Titus was away; and this so wrought upon me as to compel me to this course." Those who have the grace of charity are not content to be united in soul only, they seek for the personal presence of him they love.

Turn once more to this scholar of charity, and you will find that so it is. "We, brethren," he says, "being bereaved of you for the time of an hour, in sight, not in heart, have hastened the more abundantly to see your face with great desire. For we would have come unto you, I, Paul, indeed, once and again, but Satan hath hindered us. For which cause, forbearing no longer, we thought it good to remain at Athens alone, and we sent Timothy." What force is there

in each expression ! That flame of charity living in his soul is manifested with singular luminousness. He does not say so much as "separated from you," nor "torn," nor "divided," nor "abandoned," but only "bereaved;" moreover, not "for a certain period," but merely "for the time of an hour;" and separated, "not in heart, but in presence only;" again, "have hastened the more abundantly to see your face." What ! it seems charity so captivated you, that you desiderated their sight, you longed to gaze upon their earthly, fleshly countenance ? "Indeed I did," he answers : "I am not ashamed to say so ; for in that seeing all the channels of the senses meet together. I desire to see your presence ; for there is the tongue which utters sounds and announces the secret feelings ; there is the hearing which receives words, and there the eyes which image the movements of the soul." But this is not all : not content with writing to them letters, he actually sends to them Timothy, who was with him, and who was more than any letters. And, "We thought it good to remain alone;" that is, when he is divided from one brother, he says he is left alone, though he had so many others with him.

The tone of this passage certainly makes it clear that, when the Saint so eagerly calls on his friends for letters, it is for his own sake, in order to supply, as best he may, the severe deprivation—the *pœna damni*, as it is called—which his absence from them caused him. However, there was obviously another reason for his wishing to hear news about them of a different kind, at a time when so many friends of his were, as being his friends, under the stroke of a severe persecution. This feeling is expressed in the following letter :

To Briso.

"Near seventy days I passed on my journey, haunted on many sides with fear of the Isaurians, and fighting with intolerable fever ; at length I reached Cucusus, the most desolate place in the whole world. I say this, not wishing you to be troublesome to any one in your attempts to effect my removal, for I have suffered my worst in suffering the hardship of the journey ; but I ask you this favour, to write to me frequently, without allowing my distance from you to act in depriving me at least of this solace. For you know how great a comfort it is to me, however afflicted or badly circumstanced I may be, to hear how you are, who love me so well ; to hear that you are in good spirits, and in health, and at your ease. As you would have me, then, on this score light of heart, write to me word of this frequently, for it will be no common restorative. You know well what joy I feel in your prosperity" (*Ep.* 234).

To enumerate the sufferings of his friends would be to

write the history of the years to which his banishment belongs. Two Bishops who had sided with him, on pretence of their being concerned in the fire which consumed the cathedral and senate-house, upon his crossing to Bithynia, were first imprisoned, and then sent into banishment. One of his lecturers, a delicate youth, was, on the same charge, put on the rack, torn with hooks, scourged, and then scorched with torches till he died. Tigrius, of whom mention was made in a former chapter, was scourged and racked, and then banished. Somewhat later, the persecution embraced all those who would not communicate with the Bishops who were successively intruded into the see of Constantinople. An imperial rescript determined that any Bishop who would not communicate with the usurper should lose his property, and be cast into exile. "Those who were rich," says Fleury, "and cared for their estates, communicated with Atticus out of policy; and those who were poor and weak in the faith suffered themselves to be seduced by bribes. But there were others who nobly disregarded their riches, their country, and all temporal advantages, and fled to escape the persecution. Several of them repaired to Rome, and others retired to the mountains, or into monasteries. The edict against the laity ordained that whosoever was invested with any dignity should be dispossessed of it; that officers and military men should be broken, and the rest of the people and tradesmen condemned to pay a large fine, and banished. Notwithstanding these menaces, the people who were faithful to St. Chrysostom, rather than communicate with Atticus, used to pray in the open air, exposed to many inconveniences."*

In this way, Cyriacus, Bishop of Emesa, was sent off to Persia, Palladius to Syene, Demetrius to the Oasis; the soldiers who conducted them treating them with great indignity and cruelty. Serapion, Bishop of Heraclea, who had made himself especially obnoxious to the schismatical party, was scourged, tortured, and banished. Hilarius, an ancient ascetic, was scourged, and banished to the furthest part of Pontus. The priests were sent away as far as to Arabia, Mesopotamia, the Thebaid, and Africa. Stephen, a monk, was scourged, imprisoned, and then banished to Pelusium. The holy women who took part with the Saint, whether in Constantinople or elsewhere, had, at an earlier date, a share in the sufferings of his cause. Olympias especially, in spite of her high birth and connections, was summoned before the prefect of the imperial city, and was heavily fined. She withdrew to Cyzicus. Pentadia, another deaconess, widow of a man who

* Book xxii. 9, Oxford translation.

had filled the consulate, was fined and imprisoned. Nicarete had to leave the city.

It is not surprising that outrages so extreme should have filled Chrysostom, not only with horror, but with the most cruel anxiety what was next to happen; and should have made him eager to learn from his correspondents the course of events without any delay. We have various letters of his, written to Bishops and others under persecution; in others he makes application in their behalf in powerful quarters, and on their liberation from prison he sends about the news of it. His exhortations to them are characteristic of the writer. He calls them "champions who are nobly fighting for the peace of the world" (*Ep.* 148). And he realises what it is to be a champion. He understands well that their prison was not merely a building, or a chamber, or a courtyard with a strong door to it, an honourable confinement, or the *surveillance* of an officer: "You are the inmates of a prison," he writes; "you are encompassed with chains, shut up with foul and filthy men. Who, then, can be more blessed than you? What have bright and spacious mansions to compare in value with that murky, filthy, fetid, and tormenting prison, undergone for God's sake?" (*Ep.* 118). And he entreats them not to lose heart, but "day by day to prosecute their labours for the churches of the world, that there may be such a settlement of matters as is suitable, and no abandonment of their cause because of their being so few and so baited on every side" (*Ep.* 174).

He set the example himself of what he preached; he never thought of dispensing himself from the ordinary oversight of his church, so far as it was possible, even though he had been removed, as he says, to the extremity of the Roman world. He had thoughts to bestow even on the remissness of individual ecclesiastics at Constantinople. Several of his letters are devoted to the case of two of his priests, who, whether from fear of the court or other reason, had during his absence seldom preached or been present at the public devotions. "It has given me no common pain," he writes to one of them, "that both you and the priest Theophilus should have relaxed in your duties. I have been informed that one of you has only preached five homilies up to October, and the other none at all. This news has tried me more than my desolate state here. Please to tell me, then, if I am mistaken; if not, make a reformation. How are you excusable if, at a time when others are in persecution, sent into exile, and variously harassed, you neither by your presence nor your teaching exert yourselves for your distressed people?"

(*Ep.* 203.) He sends equally strong remonstrances to Theophilus. "Now," he says, "is the very time for glory and much gain. The merchant does not get together his cargo by sitting down in harbour, but by venturing across open seas" (*Ep.* 119). And he writes to a friend to complain of his not having been told the state of things. "I am informed," he says, "that the one from indolence, the other from cowardice, has not attended the sacred assembly. To Theophilus I have written severely; Sallust I refer to you, for I know, and am pleased to know, how much you are attached to him. And I am pained that you have not even informed me, much less set him right, as you should have done. Now I beg you to do both yourself and me the great kindness of giving him a startling notice, and not to suffer him to sleep or to be idle. For if he does not show becoming courage in our present tempestuous weather, what good will he be to us when calm and peace succeed?" (*Ep.* 210.)

While he thus kept his eyes on his clergy at home, he was exemplifying the same zeal for the conversion of the heathen which we have seen in him at Nicæa. At that time he had been busying himself in the extension of religion in Phœnicia; and though Cucusus was, as he says, at the extremity of the empire, it was on that very account only the more central place for missionary enterprises in the wide range of countries which bordered upon it. As to Phœnicia, he obtained funds for the missionaries, he sent relics for their new churches, he encouraged them to perseverance in persecution, and he provided them with fresh labourers. One of his letters is a recommendation to a friend of a holy priest, who had succeeded in converting the pagans of Mount Amanus,—the Black Mountain, between himself and Antioch,—and had built churches and monasteries among them. He interested himself also in the conversion of the Goths, who at that time were on the left bank of the Don, and still adhered to their nomad habits. He endeavoured to secure them a successor to their Bishop, who was lately dead; and he wrote to some Goths in a monastery at Constantinople on the subject. He enters upon it in that letter to Olympias in which he details the sufferings of his journey. Those sufferings, however keen, had no power to divert his mind for however short a time from the apostolical duties of his Patriarchate. In the same letter he also speaks of the prospect which was then opening of the conversion of the Persians, and makes mention of St. Maruthas, who was at the time doing so much for the extension of the faith among them. Maruthas, from misinformation, had allied himself with the enemies of St. Chrysostom; and

the latter was very desirous both to gain him and to forward his work. He had written two letters to Maruthas, without getting an answer; and as the zealous missionary was at this time at Constantinople, he wrote to Olympias to make acquaintance with him. "Do not fail," he says, "to show all the attention in your power to the Bishop Maruthas, in order to draw him out of that pit. I have the greatest need of him for the affairs of Persia; and learn from him, if you can, what success he has had there" (*Ep.* 14). He did not forget, in these more expansive thoughts, the welfare of the poor people who were his immediate neighbours. We have seen him refusing sums of money when offered to him by friends; one of the channels into which he contrived to divert their liberality was the supply of the wants of the poor round about him, especially during a famine which happened while he was at Cucusus. He also redeemed from slavery many who had been taken captive by the Isaurian robbers, and sent them to their homes.

Amid these various exercises of faith and piety he had not been neglectful of the duties of the cause for which he suffered banishment. It was incumbent upon him to rouse Christendom in his own behalf, and he had been prompt and earnest in doing so. We have letters written by him to the Bishops of Thessalonica, Corinth, Synnada, Laodicea, Mopsuestia, Jerusalem, Carthage, Milan, Brescia, and Aquileia. Above all, he addressed himself to the Holy See, and his friends zealously prosecuted the appeal which he initiated. Many of them had fled to Rome; and though Pope Innocent did not at once decide on the main points at issue between the Saint and his enemies, yet he had no scruple in acknowledging him and communicating with him as Bishop of Constantinople, and by consequence in rejecting the pretensions of the schismatical party which had taken possession of his see. Innocent could do no more at the moment; but it was easy to prophesy what his ultimate determination would be. Every thing then seemed turning out in the Saint's favour; his reputation, his celebrity, his influence, had been greatly increased by the measures which his enemies had taken to ruin him. He was doing greater things at Cucusus than he had done at Constantinople. Debarred from the exercise of his special gift, his eloquent voice, he moved more forcibly the hearts of men by his very absence from the scene of the world; and he had the opportunity of showing how little he depended on the breath of popular favour, how much on himself and on his God, for that vigour and energy which had been the characteristics of his public life.

Habitually sanguine, he shared the belief of his friends that the triumph of his cause was at hand. As he had no resentments in respect to his persecutors, so he had no misgivings about his coming victory over them; and if his hopefulness forfeits for him the praise of prophecy, it evinces the more excellent grace of patience and trust. He was as easy about the future at Cucusus as he had been at Nicæa. He writes to Olympias thus:

"I do not despair of happier times, considering that He is at the helm of the universe who overcomes the storm, not by human skill, but by His *fiat*. If He does not do so at once, this is because it is His rule to take this course; and, when evils have increased and reached their fullness, and a change is despaired of by the many, then to work His marvellous and strange work, manifesting that power which is His prerogative, while exercising withal the endurance of the afflicted. Never be cast down, then; for one thing alone is fearful, that is, sin" (*Ep.* 1).

Again:

"Cherish a full conviction that you will see me again, and will be released from your present distress, and will receive the great gain, now as hitherto, which follows from it" (*Ep.* 2).

And still more strikingly in the following interesting and touching passage, which belongs to a later year of his exile:

"I speak not for the sake of consoling you, but I know that so it absolutely shall be. For, unless it were so to be, long ago, as it seems to me, should I have departed hence, so far as the trials go which have come upon me. For, not to speak of all that I suffered in Constantinople, you may easily understand how many things have happened to me since I left the city, in my long and painful journey hitherto, most of which were enough to cause my death; how many things after I arrived here, how many things after my dislodgment from Cucusus, how many things during my stay at Arabissus. Yet I got through them all, and am now in health and in all safety, to the astonishment of all the Armenians, that a frame so feeble, so spider-like, should be able to bear such unbearable cold, should be able to breathe in it, when even those who are accustomed to sharp winters are seriously affected by it. Nevertheless I have remained unharmed even to this day, and have escaped the hands of brigands in their many inroads; and have been preserved amid want of the necessaries of life, and without even a bath to recruit me, although when I was in Constantinople I had constant need of one; yet here I have found my state of body such that I have not even had a desire for this refreshment, and have been all the healthier. And no insalubrity of air, nor desolateness of place, nor absence of stores, nor scarcity of drugs, nor unskilfulness of physicians, nor difficulty of baths, nor absolute confinement, or rather imprisonment, in one

room, nor want of exercise, which was always necessary to me, nor my atmosphere of smoke, nor alarms of robbers, nor the state of siege, nor any other hardship, has availed to destroy me ; but I am in better health here than I was with you, though I then took such care of myself. Think over all this, and shake off the despondency with which my trial has oppressed you, and give over your needless and painful self-inflictions" (*Ep.* 4).

And then he goes on to bid her read a treatise which he sends her, and which has for its title the noble maxim, "Be true to yourself, and no one can harm you."

And here I pause in my sketch of the last years of this many-gifted saint, this most natural and human of the creations of supernatural grace. O.

ON THE SIGNS OF MARTYRDOM IN THE CATACOMBS.

M. LE BLANT begins his remarks on the subject of the present article by saying that it is *pleine de péril pour qui veut l'aborder*. On the other hand, it is full of interest ; and the time seems to be now arrived for a full and candid examination of the question which it involves. Only let those who take part in the examination do so with moderation and prudence ; let them think of themselves as being "debtors both to the wise and to the unwise," abstain from all positive assertion where the evidence is only doubtful, and treat with becoming gentleness the hereditary belief of past generations, even where modern scientific research may have proved it to be erroneous. It is in this spirit at least that I desire to offer the following contribution towards the elucidation of the question at issue ; a contribution which is not made without some misgivings and reluctance, and of which I may truly say, as the Jesuit Ferrandi said two centuries ago of his treatise on a kindred subject: *Meis e manibus non sine aliquâ nonnullorum prece, dicam extortum an exoratum?* I would add, however, with the same learned and conscientious writer: *Serviendum est multorum votis, concedendum est aliquid amicorum hortatibus, dandum aliquid publicæ utilitati.*

Nothing is more clearly written in the pages of ecclesiastical history than the exceeding care of the early Christians in all that concerned the martyrs of the Church. Scribes or notaries were appointed by the Sovereign Pontiffs for the several parishes or regions of the city of Rome, who should collect their *Acts*; and notices abound, both of clergy and laity,

men and women, who spared no expenditure either of time or money—nay, even risked life itself—to honour their bodies with a becoming burial. Indeed, this was so general and notorious, that even the heathen themselves were aware of it, and used every means which the most diabolical malice could suggest to frustrate this holy purpose of the Christians. I need not quote a number of examples* in detail to prove what cannot be unknown even to the veriest tyro in the study of Christian archæology. I may be allowed, however, briefly to refer to the statement of St. Ambrose with reference to the bodies of Vitalis and Agricola,†—a master and his servant, in the north of Italy, who fell under the persecution of Diocletian,—that they were buried among the sepulchres of the Jews, *that their fellow-Christians might not know them*. It is clear from this (and from several other examples which could be adduced) that one great object of the Church's solicitude in this matter concerned something that she desired to have done with the bodies of the martyrs even after their burial. She was anxious, not only that they should receive the rites of sepulture, but also that she should know the place of their burial. And the reason of this is made manifest by the practice of the Church when she had that knowledge. Prudentius, speaking of the tomb of the martyr Hippolytus, describes the multitudes whose devotion led them to frequent it in the following words:

“ Mane salutatum concurritur ; omnis adorat
Pubes ; eunt, redeunt, solis ad usque obitum.”

And in another hymn, speaking of the sand which had been saturated with the blood of the martyrs Emiterius and Chelidonius, he says :‡

“ Incolæ
Frequentant observantes
Voce, votis, munere ;
Externi, necnon et orbis
Huc colonus advenit.”

We see, then, that the graves of the martyrs, and all places consecrated by their blood, were an object of tender devotion to the early Christians ; so that it seems impossible but that they must have had some means of distinguishing in a general cemetery the tomb of a martyr from the tombs of ordinary Christians. Of course there would be no risk of forgetting the tombs of the more celebrated martyrs,—of those who had occupied a prominent position in the Church during their lifetime, such as Bishops, priests, or deacons, or members of noble families, or persons who had suffered extraordinary tor-

* Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iv. 14, v. 1, viii. 6.

† Epist. lib. vii. 55.

‡ Peristeph. Hymn 1.

ments, or died under some other peculiar circumstances. But where martyrdoms were so frequent as to be in fact innumerable,—where men, women, and children of every rank suffered indiscriminately together,—the memory of so many graves could not be safely trusted to mere local tradition; it could only be retained by certain plain and definite signs. Such at least, as it appears to me, is a very natural and reasonable conclusion to draw from the facts which have been mentioned; and if it be objected that there is no distinct historical evidence testifying to the use of these marks of distinction, I would point to the words of St. Ambrose, when he is relating to his sister the discovery of the bodies of SS. Gervasius and Protasius. After having mentioned the spot where he had ordered excavations to be made, he says, “*Inveni signa convenientia* ;”^{*} and then presently describes the condition in which he found the bodies, as though these *signa convenientia* had been something exterior to the grave, yet very near it. We must not forget, however, that this was not spoken of graves in the Catacombs of Rome. A passage in Prudentius, which is often quoted in connection with this subject, seems more to the point, topographically at least, for it certainly refers to Rome and to the Catacombs of Rome; and if once it could be established by other arguments or testimony, that a martyr’s grave was always distinguished from others by some token connected with the shedding of blood, no commentator would hesitate for a moment to recognise an allusion to this practice in the following lines from the hymn in honour of St. Laurence :

“ Vix fama nota est abditis
Quam plena Sanctis Roma sit ;
Quam dives urbanum solum
Sacris sepulcris floreat.
Sed qui caremus his bonis,
Nec sanguinis vestigia
Videre coram possumus,
Coelum intuemur eminùs.”

However, be this as it may, it is certainly not to be wondered at, that, when the Catacombs were rediscovered towards the close of the sixteenth century, the devotion of Catholics should seek with eagerness for the tombs of those heroes of the Christian faith who had laid down their lives in its defence, and that they should expect to find some distinguishing mark upon them. It is equally to be expected, perhaps, that, in the absence of any certain tradition, their ignorance and inexperience should betray them, at first and for a while, into

* Epist. lib. vii. 54.

some errors. It is with the history of these errors, or of one them, that we are now concerned.

Mabillon* denies that either the cross, the monogram, the heart, the dove, or the lamb (any of them taken singly, or all together) constituted a sure sign of martyrdom; and Fortunato Scacchi, the Augustinian and Pope's sacristan, had said the same thing fifty years before.† It is much to be regretted that these writers should have so expressed themselves as to convey the impression that, at some time or other, the Church had thought otherwise, and had been in the habit of extracting bodies from the Catacombs, as though they were the bodies of martyrs, merely upon the faith of these emblems. Indeed, in another place, Mabillon, misled by false information and writing anonymously,‡ expressly affirmed that she had done so; but in a second edition of his work he retracted the false accusation. It is not surprising, therefore, that anti-Catholic writers should have taken advantage of these authorities to repeat the charge; though, in truth, it seems never to have had any foundation in fact. I find, indeed, a Bishop,§ in the middle of the seventeenth century, who understood the monogram XP to be an abbreviation of the words "Pro Christo," and therefore to be a sign of martyrdom; and I have heard an ecclesiastic, conducting strangers through the Catacombs, repeat the same error: but these persons not being in authority, their private erroneous opinion in no way affected the practice of the Church, nor was it derived from it. Thus, at the very time that the Bishop of whom I have spoken, who was Vicegerent of Rome under Urban VIII., was writing his work, we have the evidence of the Jesuit Fathers, examined by order of the Cardinal-Vicar as to the authenticity of the relics in possession of their General; and part of this evidence affects the question on which we are engaged. At that time the Popes were in the habit of granting to different individuals or religious communities special privileges to enter the Catacombs, and extract from them whatever objects of interest or religious veneration they found there. The Jesuits amongst others had availed themselves of a privilege of this kind, and extracted largely from the Catacomb of Sta. Priscilla, as it was then called, a considerable portion of which lay under one of their own vineyards. They were asked what signs or emblems they had trusted as certain proofs of martyrdom; and their answer was very distinct and positive, that

* *Iter Italicum*, tom. i. p. 138.

† *De Cult. et Vener. Serv. Dei*, sect. ix. c. 2, ed. 1639.

‡ *Epist. Euseb. Rom.*

§ *Ant. Ricciul. Lucubr. Eccl. lib. i. c. xxxi. n. 10*, ed. 1643.

they had removed no bodies which were not found in graves, either (1) with axes, heads of spears, leaden scourges, *ungulae*, or other instruments of torture; or (2) with an *ampulla*, or some glass or earthen vessel, stained with blood; or (3) with a palm-branch engraved on the tombstone, or rudely scratched in the mortar which secured it. Here, then, we have three signs whereby the Church at that time, or at least one of the most distinguished religious bodies in the Church, professed to recognise the tombs of the martyrs. Of course it is very possible that less learned or less scrupulous persons may have admitted a larger number of tests; but time and space forbid us to pursue our inquiries any further in this direction. And it is not necessary, since all these private faculties were subsequently annulled by Clement XI., who desired to reserve so important a matter more immediately to himself; and his successor, Clement XII., made a decree on the 13th of January 1672, intrusting the care of all the Catacombs to the Cardinal-Vicar of Rome. Henceforward uniformity of practice in the recognition of relics taken from the Catacombs was effectually secured; and the rule by which it was governed is thus expressed in the decree of a commission specially appointed for the purpose in 1668:*

“Upon the question of the signs by which the genuine relics of the holy martyrs can be distinguished from false and doubtful ones, the same Sacred Congregation, after diligent examination, expressed its opinion that the palm-branch and the vessel coloured with their blood should be considered as certain marks; the discussion of other signs it deferred to a future day.”

Already one of the three tokens which in 1628 had been accepted by the Jesuits as certain and trustworthy, is abandoned, or at least passed over in silence, and thereby branded as doubtful, viz. instruments of martyrdom found in the grave. The reason of this decision is not given; perhaps the commission considered that sufficient care had not been taken, or that it was almost impossible to decide with certainty in some cases, whether or not the objects found in the grave had really been used as instruments of torture. On the one hand, we have the express testimony of St. Ambrose that he found the wood of the cross on which St. Agricola had been crucified close to his tomb, and nails in the grave of St. Vitalis,—nails from which he says the holy martyr had received “more wounds than there were limbs in his body;” and it seems certain that it was by no means uncommon to bury the instruments of martyrdom with the body itself. On the other

* It has already appeared in the *Rambler* for January in this year (vol. ii. p. 201); but for the sake of clearness it is better to reproduce it.

hand, Mr. Northcote mentions in his account of the Christian museums in Rome, that some of the objects preserved there as having been taken from the graves of martyrs in C  ta-combs, "look more like domestic utensils, and seem to be of Etruscan workmanship." However, we need not trouble ourselves any further with the reasons of the decision; the fact itself is what really concerns us, and is of importance, that the decree of the Commission in 1668 set aside one of the tokens which had been accepted and acted upon forty years before by the Jesuits, and itself laid down two, "after diligent examination," as being "most certain,"—the palm-branch and the vessel coloured with blood. This decree, however, did not meet with universal acceptance. Mabillon* continually denied that the palm-branch was any sign of martyrdom; Papebroch, Scacchi, Ricciul, Fabretti, Arevalo, and many others, both before and since his days, were of the same opinion; until at length Benedict XIV., in his great work upon the Beatification and Canonisation of Saints,† subscribed to the same judgment; and henceforth the blood-stained *ampulla* alone was received as the unequivocal token of martyrdom.

It is scarcely necessary to examine in detail the objections that were urged against the palm-branch as a certain token; for, as in the former case, so here also, the main fact that concerns us is not so much the correctness or otherwise of the decision come to, but rather the fact that the Holy See did not hesitate to abandon its own previous rule and practice, when, after more diligent examination, it saw good reason for doing so. I may mention, however, *en passant*, that some of the objections might have been, and by some authors were, as strongly urged against the *ampulla* as against the palm-branch; and yet most, if not all, of these authors never seem to have doubted about the one sign, whilst they loudly condemned the other. It was said, for instance, about the palm-branch, that it was often found on the same grave with the words "*in pace*," which were supposed to exclude the possibility of a cruel and bloody death. It was answered, in the words of Holy Scripture,‡ that "though the martyrs seemed to suffer torments, and their departure was taken for misery, yet they are in peace;" and instances

* Euseb. Rom. p. 17, ed. Paris, 1705.

† The remark does not appear in the edition of his work published in 1738, whilst he was Cardinal Lambertini; but I find it in the Roman edition of 1749, book iv. part ii. c. 27. Cornelius    Lapide (ad Heb. x. 38) acknowledges, Muratori (Antiq. Ital. tom. v. p. 33) rejects, the palm as a sign of martyrdom.

‡ Wisdom iii. 2, 3.

were quoted in which persons were said to have died in peace who yet were slain in battle, or in other ways met with their death by violence.* Or again, it was objected that the palm-branch was often found on the graves of very young children, even of mere infants. It was answered, that it was by God's own appointment, that "out of the mouth of infants and of sucklings He has perfected praise;" that the very first martyrs were the Holy Innocents, of whom St. Peter Chrysologus says, "*moriuntur inconscii, ignari tollunt palmas, coronas rapiunt ignorantes*;" that Eusebius† tells us of men and women, and even little children, who fell under the persecution in Egypt; that Dionysius of Alexandria‡ says the same; and moreover, that it has been seen even in modern times (*e. g.* in the martyrdoms of Japan) how a bitter hatred of the Christian name can so far overcome man's natural instincts of humanity as to cause him to imbrue his hands in the blood of innocent young children.

We come, lastly, to the *ampulla* found outside many of the graves in the Catacombs, and supposed to contain blood shed in martyrdom by the person buried therein. A correspondent in the last *Rambler*,§ signing himself "J. P.," says that he is in a position to affirm, that ever since the close of the sixteenth century "there has been a *catena* of most learned men who had but small confidence in the genuineness of the *corpi santi* extracted from the Catacombs, because they doubted of the sufficiency . . . of the so-called phials of blood which were usually found at the head of the graves, to prove the martyrdom of the tenant of the tomb." I am somewhat surprised at this statement, and it certainly does not tally with the impression left on my own mind by all I have been able to read on the matter. Benedict XIV. says distinctly that no one has ever doubted of this sign. However, "J. P." is evidently perfectly familiar with his subject, and he has had an advantage which I have not had, of reading the work printed in Brussels in 1855, of which he speaks, and whose title is *De Phialis rubricatis, quibus Martyrum Romanorum sepulchra dignosci dicuntur observationes V. D. B.* Doubtless there have been learned Protestants who have entertained grave doubts on the trustworthiness of this token; but then they can scarcely be considered fair judges on such a topic, since their learning is more than outweighed by their prejudice. Neither, again, is the authority of such a writer as Raoul-Rochette of much weight towards forming even a single link

* 4 Kings xxii. 20, xxiii. 29. On the other hand, cf. 3 Kings ii. 6; Jeremias xxxiv. 4, &c.

† Hist. Eccl. viii. 9.

‡ Ibid. vii. 10.

§ Vol. iii. p. 114.

of this *catena*; and for myself, I am really unable to quote others. I should have said that the weight of authority was, previous at least to our own times, altogether on the side of the authenticity of the *ampulla*, even though learned writers, like Muratori, Marini, Mai, and others, have occasionally found some difficulty in admitting it in this or that particular instance. Quite recently, however, this question has assumed a very different aspect; and it is desirable that well-instructed Catholics should understand whence this has arisen, and what effect has been thereby produced, both in theory and practice. We will first call a witness, or advocate rather, on each side of the question, and then briefly adding some comments of our own, together with the most authentic information within our reach, state the conclusion in which we believe all the most learned antiquarians of Rome are now agreed on this very important question.

Our advocate in favour of the *ampulla* shall be "C.," the careful and conscientious writer of an article on the subject in the *Rambler* of last January; his opponent, Monsieur Edmond Le Blant, author of a very short *brochure* entitled *La Question du Vase de Sang*, of which only one hundred copies, I believe, were printed in Paris, two or three years ago, and one presented to each member of the Academy.

Before comparing these two authors, however, it will be necessary to make a distinction which is very generally overlooked in the examination of this question. There are, in fact, two separate points to be considered: first, whether the phials ever really contained blood; secondly, whether that blood was of the person buried in the grave to which the phial was attached, and was intended to be a token of his martyrdom.

To establish the first of these points, "C." alleges arguments of three different kinds,—historical, monumental, and chemical: First, that passage from the hymn of Prudentius in honour of St. Laurence, which has been already quoted, and characterised as indistinct and inconclusive, though decidedly favourable to "C.'s" view of the case. Secondly, the letters S A, or S A N G, rudely scratched on the mortar in which some few of these vessels were originally fastened; but this is unfortunately now acknowledged to be a forgery,—at least so Padre Garrucci assures us, both on his own judgment of the calligraphy and other tokens, and also on the strength of other arguments, to be by and by adduced, by the Cavaliere de' Rossi;* and where these two great authorities are agreed, there is little danger of their sentence being reversed by any appeal to a higher tribunal. Lastly, "C." relies on the test of

* Hagioglypta a Joanne Macario, p. 107.

a chemical analysis undertaken by the Protestant philosopher Leibnitz, at the request of the antiquarian and *custode* of the Roman Catacombs, Fabretti; and this has certainly very great weight, especially considering the source from which it comes. It is to be observed, however, that Leibnitz expresses himself with great caution and reserve: "*Nata nobis meritò suspicio est, sanguineam potius materiam quàm terrestrem esse.*" Dr. Maitland, indeed, and some other modern writers, have insinuated that "the experiments instituted by Leibnitz are far from being satisfactory to the modern practical chemist;" but he altogether overlooks the fact, which to my mind is perhaps the strongest proof of all, as to the contents of these phials, viz. that in many of them the blood has actually been found in a fresh and liquid state. Arringhi tells us that it had happened again and again (*sæpe sæpius*), in the presence of many witnesses, that, in attempting to detach the vase from the strong mass of cement in which it was embedded, the vase had been broken (which it is often impossible to prevent), and liquid blood spilt upon the ground. Boldetti says that he had frequently seen one of these vessels with liquid blood, which had come from a tomb in the cemetery of Sta. Cyriaca, and was among the relics shown by the Jesuit Fathers at San Ignazio; but one day, whilst Boldetti was yet writing his book, it dropped from the hands of some one who was examining it, and was broken. Marangoni found one inside a grave in the cemetery of St. Thraso in which the watery portion of the blood floated on the surface, and the red portion had sunk to the bottom: when the vessel was shaken they mixed, but when it was at rest they again separated. He found another also outside a grave in the same cemetery; and both were preserved in his own house until the disastrous fire in 1737, which destroyed so many of his papers and other valuable relics connected with the Catacombs.

I cannot think it at all doubtful, then, but that these *ampullæ* really contained blood; and if blood, it is inconceivable that it should have been any thing else than the blood of martyrs. But what I question, or rather what "the stern logic of facts" now obliges all Roman antiquarians to question, is, whether the blood in the vase without the grave is of the tenant within the grave. "C." asserts this on the authority, as he supposes, of the best modern Christian antiquarians, Father Marchi (R.I.P.) and the Cav. de' Rossi. "J.P.," on the other hand, writing to the *Rambler* in May, and evidently with a very accurate knowledge of all the facts of the case, asserts that "De' Rossi is well known in Rome to entertain exactly the contrary opinion."


"C.'s" authority having failed him, we turn next to his arguments. He adduces a number of ancient testimonies; but I think a candid inquirer will be forced to acknowledge that for the most part they fall just short of the purpose for which "C." requires them. His opponent, the Edinburgh Reviewer, had said that "he found no allusion in contemporary writers to the practice of collecting the blood of dead martyrs in a bottle *to be placed in their graves.*" "C." quotes several passages from Prudentius showing that it was a very common practice of the early Christians to collect the blood shed by the martyrs in the midst of their torments; but all his testimonies, with one solitary exception, are silent as to the use to be afterwards made of the blood so collected; and *that* one assigns a somewhat different use from that which "C." desires to prove. It is said of the blood of St. Vincent that those who were present at his martyrdom collected it,

"Tutamen ut sacrum suis
Domi reservent posteris."

It seems, then, that they desired to preserve this blood as a sacred treasure in their own homes, not that they might bury it at the martyr's tomb. And the original acts of his martyrdom* tell us the same thing, almost in the same words: "*sanguinem linteis excipiunt, sacrâ veneratione posteris profuturum.*" However, it can scarcely be said, perhaps, that this use of the martyr's blood is altogether inconsistent with the other; so that if "C." has not succeeded in establishing his position, neither has his adversary succeeded in overthrowing it. The passages to which he refers in St. Ambrose would seem to tell much more strongly in his favour, if only the ancient Christian burial-places at Milan had at all resembled the Catacombs of Rome. I allude, of course, to that letter addressed to his brother Bishops and to all the faithful of Italy, concerning the finding of the bodies of SS. Vitalis and Agricola, in which he says "*collegimus sanguinem triumphalem;*" and again, writing to his sister about the bodies of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, "we found all the bones perfect, *sanguinis plurimum.*" However, not even this can be fairly alleged as proving any ancient practice of placing a phial of the martyr's blood outside his grave by way of a token to distinguish it from others'.

But it is time that we should hear the advocate on the other side. M. Le Blant's short pamphlet consists of little else than objections against the popular belief that the *ampulla* was an unequivocal sign of martyrdom. They are stated briefly and pointedly. I will first enumerate them, and then

* Apud Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, tom. i. p. 731, ed. 1713.

comment on them. The first, on which he rightly lays the greatest stress, is simply chronological, and consists of these two items: (1) several of the graves, eight or nine perhaps, to which the vase was attached have inscriptions upon them with consular dates, and these belong to an epoch subsequent to the persecutions; (2) several others, nearly a hundred, are marked with the monogram , which the wisest antiquarians consider to have been decidedly posterior to the conversion of Constantine. Le Blant's second objection is of a more subtle kind. The Roman martyrology of Baronius, he says, gives the names of 311 men and only 73 women as having suffered martyrdom in the city,—and this must be taken as representing the real proportion between the two sexes in this particular; whereas, if the vase of blood be accepted as a true token of martyrdom, the numbers of the two sexes thus added to the calendar would be nearly equal. Thirdly, he observes that some of the graves on which this token is found are marked by inscriptions containing prayers for the deceased,—prayers for light, life, rest, and refreshment,—for which, according to the ordinary interpretation of the vase, there would have been no need; whilst others without this token express the most perfect confidence as to the deceased's happiness, *e.g.* "We know you to be in Christ;" "You live in the glory and peace of the Lord, in God," &c. Fourthly, the epitaphs on many of these tombs are defaced by an enumeration of trifling details or most ordinary panegyrics, quite out of place in commemorating a martyr, and strikingly unlike the epitaphs of known and certain martyrs, which are always marked by a most exquisite simplicity, such as *Cornelius Martyr Ep., D.P. III. Idus Septembr.; Yacinthus Martyr, &c.* Nay, further still, some of them express even semi-pagan sentiments, and bear at their beginnings the old pagan formula, D.M. Fifthly, there is no vase found at the tombs of some persons who are yet known to have been martyrs, *e.g.* St. Cecilia, St. Cornelius, and St. Hyacinth. Sixthly, there is no mention of the practice in Prudentius or any other ancient author. Seventhly, Pope Gregory IV. in the middle of the ninth century wrote to a Bishop of Mayence, who had asked for the body of a martyr, saying that they had all been already removed from the Catacombs and appropriated to other churches; yet very many have continually been found ever since by means of this token, to which it is clear, therefore, that neither Gregory IV. nor Paschal attached any importance. Eighthly and lastly, it sometimes happens that

two, or even three, of these *ampullæ* are to be found attached to a single grave.

Even the most casual observer cannot fail to be struck with the unequal character of these objections; some are manifestly inconclusive, and the real student of the Roman Catacombs will find no great difficulty in disposing of most of them. Thus, to pass over for a while the first or chronological objection, who will recognise any great strength in the second? Indeed, I think the author would find it extremely difficult, not to say impossible, to prove the truth of his premisses in this argument, to say nothing of the legitimacy and then the relevancy of the conclusion. By far the larger portion of the graves marked by the *ampulla* are without epitaphs and anonymous; and unless we know the sex of all these nameless occupants of graves, we are scarcely in a position to enter upon such calculations as Le Blant has attempted. Then as to the objection that on some of the graves of these supposed martyrs are to be found prayers for the repose of their souls, as though their happiness was doubtful and needed our suffrages, what would M. Le Blant say to the following inscriptions, which are still to be seen in the Catacomb of SS. Nereus and Achilles?

... VIBAS IN PACE ET PETE PRO NOBIS.

... ΖΗΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΚΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΡΩΤΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΗΜΩΝ.*

Is it possible that the persons to whom these epitaphs belonged were martyrs, or not? The survivors seem to pray for them; therefore it cannot be that they have entered on their eternal rest; but, on the other hand, the survivors also ask their prayers, and therefore they were confident about their happiness; and this could only be, or at least might have been, because they had laid down their lives for the faith. Certainly, if no stronger arguments than these can be urged against the decision of the Commission of 1668, it is not likely to be set aside; for it is not disproved—its credit is scarcely affected at all. But next, the epitaphs of these supposed martyrs are often defaced by unbecoming lamentations or very commonplace praises: a soldier enumerates the years of his military service; a widow records the exact length of her widowhood, and that she supported herself, and was not at the public charges of the Church; a husband praises his wife's sweetness of temper, that they had lived together without strife (*sine ullâ querelâ*), that she had borne him three children, that she lived thirty years, and had been married

* Northcote's Roman Catacombs, p. 133, 2d edition.

so many years, four months, and fifteen days; but, spite of this particular enumeration of facts, of virtues, of days and months and years, not a hint is given of the deceased having enjoyed so high and glorious a privilege as to be added to the noble army of martyrs. No doubt there is an incongruity in this, yet not so absolute an inconsistency as to render the two things perfectly incompatible: the inconsistency is scarcely greater than that which Le Blant himself is obliged to admit in the case of certain epitaphs which distinctly unite in themselves pagan and Christian sentiments, and are of undoubted Christian origin, *e.g.* a declaration borrowed from the heathen, and expressed in heathen phraseology, that no man is immortal, followed by the Christian formula *in pace*. The world did not all at once abandon its ancient mode of thought and expression, and begin to speak with strict theological and devotional propriety, as soon as it was converted; such changes can only be perfected by the lapse of time. Neither will grace at any time altogether overcome and extinguish nature in all the members even of a most edifying Christian community: it is very possible to have a right and true appreciation of the glory of martyrdom, yet to be keenly alive to the loss we have ourselves suffered through the death of the martyred child or parent, husband or brother. The fifth objection of M. Le Blant rests on the absence of the vase from the graves of known martyrs, such as St. Cecilia, St. Cornelius, and St. Hyacinth; and on this I would observe, first, that negative argument is never very conclusive, especially when urged against a doctrine or practice that has been long in possession; but, secondly, that he has been singularly unfortunate in his choice of examples. St. Cecilia did not shed her blood in martyrdom precisely as other martyrs did. Her acts tell us that the executioner failed in his attempts to cut off her head. He inflicted deep wounds, and the bystanders reverently wiped the wounds with linen cloths, which were found in her tomb, deeply stained with blood, when Pope Paschal I. removed her body from the Catacombs in the early part of the ninth century, and again when her tomb was reopened in the time of Clement VIII. But the saint quietly resigned her life three days after the attempt at decapitation, and then her body was not laid in a simple shroud, and deposited on one of the shelves (so to call them) in the galleries of the Catacombs, after the ordinary manner, but it was enclosed in a rough coffin of cypress-wood, and buried with special honour by Pope Urban near to the burial-place of the Popes themselves. There were peculiar reasons, then, in this case which may have interfered with the usual practice in re-


ference to the *ampulla* at the graves of martyrs. The tomb of St. Cornelius too is a manifest exception to the common rule of burial in the Catacombs. Mr. Northcote tells us that the tomb is not a simple shelf like the others, but quite a large deep vault with an arched roof; and this because he did not die at Rome, but at Civita Vecchia, whence his body was brought to Rome, and interred in the cemetery of St. Callixtus, by the private devotion of some noble Roman lady. But, lastly, there was no *ampulla* found at the grave of St. Hyacinth. I am not quite so certain about this, but I have not the work of Father Marchi at hand to resolve my doubt. However, this I know, that his bones were found partly burnt to a cinder, and all having manifestly been subjected to the action of fire. In the absence, then, of any genuine acts of his martyrdom, we are at liberty to conclude that he suffered death by fire, and not by the sword; and in this way the non-appearance of any *ampulla* is satisfactorily accounted for. M. Le Blant's sixth argument, based on the silence of contemporary writers, has been sufficiently examined before; and the seventh and eighth need not detain us long. It is easy to answer, with reference to the letter of Gregory IV., that he was speaking of the more famous martyrs whose praises were in all the churches, not of those "hidden saints" of whom Prudentius speaks, and with whose sepulchres he testifies that the Roman soil abounds; and as to two or more of these *ampullæ* being found at the same grave, we know also that two or more persons, and even two or more martyrs, were often buried in the same grave, and perhaps the plurality of vases without the grave might only be intended to indicate the number of tenants within: but even were it otherwise, I do not see how the fact can really be made to tell as an objection for the end proposed.

My readers, if any have been patient enough to follow me through this long examination of the reasoning of M. Le Blant's pamphlet, may be somewhat perplexed as to the drift of my argument. They know that I am going to maintain that the vase of blood is not a sure sign of martyrdom, and yet I have been seeking to refute or throw discredit on every argument urged by Le Blant in behalf of the same conclusion. Nevertheless, I have not been arguing without a purpose, and one which I think my readers will appreciate as soon as they recognise it. It is briefly this: that if so large a proportion of the facts and arguments which learned men can find to object to the Roman practice of the last two centuries, or century and a half, with reference to the extraction of relics from the Catacombs, be so easily disposed of, it cannot

justly be made a subject of reproach to the Holy See that it should have steadfastly persevered in the course once laid down by competent authority, and always continued to act on a decision against which it was easy indeed to urge specious objections, but which could not be overthrown by any demonstrative evidence, nor even its fallacy exposed with any thing like a high degree of moral probability. A few years ago, Rome could truly speak in the face of the whole world upon this question, by the mouth of one of its learned antiquarians, who was discussing another subject;* “Every body knows that Rome proceeds to the recognition of *corpi santi* in accordance with certain rules; and though even some good Catholics have thought that these rules have not a perfectly solid and immovable foundation, yet no one, up to the present moment, has been able to prove that they are false or founded on error.” Matters, however, are now changed, and with it the practice of the Holy See has changed. New facts have been discovered, which not only are valuable and important in themselves as bearing on the question at issue, but also throw a flood of light on other facts, known before, but not appreciated at their real value, because of themselves they were not sufficient warrant for any new conclusion.

The reader will remember that in our review of M. Le Blant’s arguments we passed over the first. It was the only one in which there was any real force, and which it was difficult to gainsay. He urged, as many had done before him, that some few of the graves to which the vase of blood was attached have inscriptions upon them with consular dates, and these dates belonged to an epoch subsequent to the persecutions. To this it had been always answered, that so long as any of the noble families of Rome, or even any considerable portion of the people, clung to the hereditary superstitions of their country, they would look with extreme jealousy upon the progress of the Christian faith, and never lose any opportunity that might present itself of wreaking their vengeance on individuals professing it; that, as it sometimes happened, during the reign of some of the more tolerant heathen emperors, that the chief magistrates or popular mobs took advantage of the emperor’s absence, or of some public tumult, to carry into execution penal laws which lay unrepealed in the statute-book, so it might well happen in later times also, as during the reign of Julian or on other occasions, that there was some partial outbreak of the pagan hatred of Christianity, to which these particular individuals whose

* P. Garrucci, S.J., in his dissertations on the *Tre Sepolcri appartenenti al culto del Bacco Sabazio*, &c. Naples, 1852.

martyrdom was called in question had fallen victims. No one can pretend that this answer was not valid and legitimate, so long as these supposed martyrs were very few in number; and I think Le Blant himself only enumerates eight or nine. But the case is widely different when their number is multiplied tenfold; the class has then become at once too large to be treated as exceptional; and this was done by the decision lately come to, on very irrefragable proofs, as to the precise chronology of the famous monogram . It had been disputed for years or rather for generations or ages, whether this symbol owed its origin to the celebrated vision of Constantine, or had been in private use among Christians long before. The indefatigable researches of De' Rossi, whilst preparing his great work on the Christian inscriptions of Rome, may be said to have now set this question at rest for ever. We are now able to say with certainty that there is no proof of the monogram ever having been used before the days of Constantine; and when this conclusion is received, we are startled to learn that on a hundred graves (more or less) in the Catacombs there has been found this symbol in conjunction with the *ampulla*. We ask ourselves whether it is probable that exceptional martyrdoms, *i. e.* martyrdoms during times of public peace, should have been so numerous, and yet no record of them be found in the pages of ecclesiastical history; our confidence is shaken in the significancy of the vase; we can no longer accept it without doubt as a sure token of martyrdom.

But this is not all. Our knowledge of the Catacombs increases; thanks to the patience and skill of one who has devoted his whole life to their study, they are no longer a dark labyrinth, whose origin and history are lost in unknown antiquity: they assume the definite form of a subterranean city, of whose builders, indeed, history has not preserved to us many written records, yet whose chronology and geography may be learned with certainty from themselves; their walls and galleries and staircases and windows* (so to speak) tell their own tale, publish their own dates, to those who have the skill to read them; and this tale, demonstrable itself, is inconsistent with the hitherto received opinion about the date of those graves which are marked with the *ampulla*; and if their date must be changed, their meaning must be changed too. *Hinc ille lacrymæ.* Henceforward the *vexata quæstio* of the meaning of the vase must be abandoned; at least the vase cannot mean that the tenant of the grave where it is found was a martyr.

* I allude, of course, to the *luminaria*.

Perhaps I can scarcely expect my readers to accept so grave a conclusion on the mere authority of an antiquarian, however eminent; but neither, on the other hand, can I anticipate his own publication of his very beautiful and interesting discoveries; but I will venture to tell a little anecdote, for the truth of which I can vouch, and which will suffice to show how far the conclusions of my friend may be trusted, even by those who have not the opportunity of examining his premisses. I forget the precise date of the rediscovery of the Catacomb of San Pretestato, or at least of the staircase which leads down to it, on the left-hand side of the Via Appia, nearly opposite the famous Catacomb of San Callisto. A gallery had been found leading out of the staircase about half way down, and the openings of a few other galleries at the foot of the staircase had been cleared of their rubbish; but as yet no inscriptions of any value had been recovered; none with a consular date, whereby to fix the chronology. De' Rossi had formed his own conjectures, or rather, I should say, had come to a very positive conclusion on this subject; but it was founded on analogy, and on a hundred signs and tokens which he had noticed, but which would have escaped any ordinary observer, and would not have been appreciated by him, even if he had seen them. One evening the corporal of the excavators, returning from his day's labour, and reporting progress to their master, said they had found an epitaph to-day, and it had the name of a consul on it, but only one; and that one was—Aurelius, let us say, or any other name that is of frequent occurrence in the Consular Fasti,—for I have forgotten the real name, and our corporal too had forgotten the *prænomen*; whether it was Titus, or Marcus, or Lucius, or what other, he couldn't say. "Where did you find it?" "At the bottom of the staircase." "Very well: I'll come out and see it to-morrow, and don't you touch it till I come." The corporal being dismissed, our antiquarian betook himself to his books and papers; and at the end of half an hour or more announced to a friend sitting in his room, "That consul must be such an one, and the inscription belongs to the year —; but it can't have been found at the bottom of the staircase. It must have come from that gallery which opens out of the staircase, on the right hand as you go down." The friend remonstrated at what seemed the absolute wildness of such conjectures; to trust his own deductions from books without having seen the stone, and, in one particular at least, *against* the testimony of those who had seen it! How could he possibly select the one Aurelius that was meant out of the five-and-twenty that *might* have been meant? and then his

verdict as to its position—it was monstrous! much learning had made him mad. “Come and see,” was the only rejoinder; and the invitation was gladly accepted. Early the following morning, the two friends stood at the bottom of the long steep staircase which dives into the Catacomb of St. Pretestato, and there at their feet lay the stone with the precious inscription. “Read it for yourself,” said the antiquarian, not condescending to stoop and see the verification of his own announcement. “The *prænomen* is Titus, isn’t it?” “Well, it is certainly; there’s no denying it. But, anyhow, you’re wrong as to its position; here it lies, just where we were told.” “Stop a minute, as to that. Corporal, where was that stone found?” “There, Signore, just where you’re standing.” “Did you find it yourself?” “No, Signore.” “Who did, then?” “Pasquale.” “Pasquale, where did you find that stone?” “Please, Signore, I dug it out of that gallery up there to the left, as you go up the stairs; but I and Valentino brought it down here out of the way, because we were afraid we should break it with our pickaxes.” The look of triumph in the antiquarian may be easily imagined; and in due course of time he vouchsafed to explain the process of reasoning by which he had been led to his conclusion. I will not trouble my readers with this, for I have already detained them too long; and my object is gained if I have succeeded in showing that somehow or other, it matters not how, learned men are able to distinguish with certainty between one portion of a Catacomb and another, and assign to each its true chronology. It only remains that I should add, that since this discovery has been made, it has been observed that graves with the *ampulla* never occur in the more ancient galleries, but abound especially in those corridors which are known to belong to the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth centuries; and having heard this fact, all candid and thoughtful inquirers must at once acknowledge that the controversy on this subject is at an end. Other objections that have been urged might be answered, or at least their force materially weakened, but from this there is no escape. It at once turns the scale finally and for ever against the supposition that the blood-stained vase is a sign of martyrdom; and hence (what “J. P.” means, I suppose, when he says that “new regulations have been made”) Rome has ceased for some years past to extract any *corpi santi* from the Catacombs, or to distribute those already extracted. Rome, with that cautious moderation and prudence which has always characterised her mode of action in matters of this kind, has silently and faithfully followed the progress of knowledge. So long as specious and

inconclusive objections only were urged against her practice, she disregarded them; when accurate and scientific knowledge could be brought to bear upon the matter, she listened and obeyed. The same authority which admitted the palm-branch two hundred years ago, and then by the mouth of Benedict XIV. rejected it, now refuses also to acknowledge that other token which the best and wisest of her children in former ages had always believed to be infallible—the vase of blood.

She still believes that the vases in question once contained the blood of martyrs, which, after having been carefully preserved, for many generations perhaps, in the families of those who had collected it, as a treasure and a defence against evil, was at length used for the consecration as it were of a grave in the Catacombs, and as a means of extending to the dead that blessing of protection of which it was piously believed to have been the frequent means or instrument to the living. It was, in fact, only another form of that practice which was common from the earliest ages, viz. of burying the dead as near as possible to the bodies of the saints. Every where in the Catacombs we see the most unequivocal proof of this desire; all proportion and symmetry is sacrificed, even paintings themselves are destroyed, in order to gratify Christian devotion in this matter. But there were necessarily limits to this practice; by and by every available portion of space must needs be occupied, and then, if they could not go near the saints, they would bring the relics of the saints near to them; and that which, as Prudentius has told us, was at first preserved at home as a *tutamen sacrum* was at length deposited at the tomb for a similar purpose. There is a curious letter, written in the year 1168, from the Dean and Chapter of some French Cathedral to the Archbishop of Cologne, in which they tell a story of the great St. Martin having begged for some of the relics of St. Maurice and the Theban legion; and when (not without a miracle) he had obtained some of their blood, it is added that he filled an *ampulla* with it, which he always carried about with him, and ordered that when he died, it should be put in his burial-place with him.* Of course this testimony falls far short of the conclusion we desire to establish in point of antiquity; but I have given it the first place because of its identity in all other respects with the custom of which I am speaking. The testimony of Sozomen will carry us much further back; and he tells us a story† of a woman named Eusebia at Constantinople, infected indeed

* Apud Surium ad Sept. 21, tom. v. p. 362, ed. Cologne, 1580.

† Hist. Eccles. lib. ix. c. 2.

with the Macedonian heresy, but having great devotion to the Forty Martyrs, of whom she had certain relics in her possession : when she was on her death-bed, she left her property to some religious, on condition that they should bury her there, *and bury with her these relics of the Forty Martyrs*. Other testimonies of the same age might be quoted, as well as proofs of another kind. And again, we have Charlemagne buried with a relic of the true cross, B. Maurus with a relic of St. Benedict, St. Bernard with a relic of St. Thaddæus, &c. &c. But as this is not the specific object of my present communication, I forbear. I will only say one word in conclusion to those who may be disposed to take amiss what we have had to say about the *ampulla* as a sign of martyrdom, and consequently about the veneration to some of the *corpi santi* extracted in times past from the Catacombs. Every Catholic knows how to distinguish between the Catholic dogma of the veneration due to relics, and the question of fact whether or not this particular relic be a true relic of a saint ; and they know also that the decision on this latter point is never propounded as an article of the faith, but rests on human evidence, which varies in each individual case. The sanction of the Church creates of course a very strong presumption in favour of any relic that is proposed to our devotion ; and it does not require any extraordinary degree of humility to prefer her authority to our own individual judgment.

J. S. N.

[J. P. writes to us, that he has reason to believe that M. de' Rossi and V. D. B., the author of the book published at Brussels, though in perfect accord in the verdict that the matter in the *ampullas* is not the blood of the tenants of the tombs in or outside which they are found, are not agreed upon the question what that matter is. M. de' Rossi thinks it to be the blood of the martyrs of the third century, or of the Diocletian persecution ; V. D. B., on the other hand, considers that the matter is probably the sediment of consecrated wine, of the Eucharistical Blood, which was buried with the bodies of the faithful.

In the absence of any very ancient testimony to the usage of burying the blood of the martyrs, V. D. B.'s theory would seem more easily defensible, since it is well known, that the usage, or rather the abuse, of burying the Blessed Sacrament with the dead was very common in primitive times. It was prohibited by a canon of the third council of Carthage before the end of the fourth century. The same canon was repealed in other councils at the end of the sixth and of the seventh centuries. A portion of a consecrated Host was buried with St. Basil by his express desire. It is said that St. Benedict desired that all his monks should be buried with a portion of the Holy Eucharist laid upon their bodies, and that this

was the ordinary mode of burial among the Greek priests. A more doubtful instance is the burial of our own St. Cuthbert, as reported by St. Bede. But in all these instances it was under the species of bread, not wine, that the Holy Eucharist was buried with the dead. It is at least singular, if the practice was so common as the *ampulla* of the Catacombs would show it to be, that no notice should, so far as we know, have come down to us of the burial of any but the species of bread.

It has also been suggested to us, that in each case a careful microscopical investigation of the deposit on the *ampulla* would suffice to show whether it is the remains of human blood or of wine. The crystals of bi-tartrate of potash in the deposit from wine would be nearly indestructible, and would be still perfectly recognisable after 2000 years. ED.]

THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE.

THERE is a cynical saying of Halifax, which has been received with great applause by several generations of like-minded men, to the effect that, however it may be with regard to the next world, men's salvation in this world depends on their want of faith. A modern poet, who sometimes sings very sweetly, Mr. Gerald Massey, has protested eloquently against this chilling doctrine; he finds that none of the great deeds which have been wrought in the world have had want of faith for their motive power:

“‘They wrought in faith,’ and not ‘they wrought in doubt,’
Is the proud epitaph inscribed above
Our glorious dead.
Because he did believe, Columbus sailed
For that new world his inner eyes had seen;
He found; so Faith its new worlds yet shall find,
While Doubt shakes its wise head, and stays behind. . .
Because we have believed our knowledge comes:
Belief, not doubt, will touch the secret spring.”

There is no charter wider in its application, more evident in its results, and at the same time a more sore trial to this worldly faith of which I am speaking, than that which, without any exceptions, limitations, or glosses, annexes the promise of finding to all seeking: “every one that seeks finds.” Never has any liberal law excited a greater measure of fanatical obscurantism than this. With lawyer-like ingenuity, Tertullian was the first to cramp its freedom, and to fit it to the narrow gauge wherewith he thought to measure heaven and earth. It is a law, he says, which must needs be in-

terpreted by the rule of reason. What is the use of seeking, he asks, unless we know exactly what we are looking for, and unless we search for it at the right time, in the right place, and in the right manner? Here is a flood-gate opened for glosses and distinctions, till the commentary on the text almost assures us that it is of no use seeking; for no one that seeks finds unless he has already found, in which case further seeking would be of doubtful utility. I know that in the spiritual domain, even Tertullian's commentary has often a very true and necessary application; but it has been filtered into the world of secular thought, where it has less title to be, and has become embalmed in popular proverbs. The Spaniards say that no traveller brings home with him more than he carries abroad. And Dr. Johnson, I think, to whose toryfied mind such an opinion would have been very congenial, caps it with the saying that no one can observe properly without knowing beforehand what to see and how to see it. In modern language, that no tourist or excursionist can enjoy his trip unless he first studies his Murray's hand-book. Doubtless it is true for many minds. I have known students who declare that they never find in books aught but what they looked for; that when they wish to find texts on a fresh topic, they have to begin again, and read the book with a new direction of their intention to the point. Certainly, if we are to believe the candid Werenfels, this is the way in which Protestant divines have used the Bible:

“Hic liber est in quo quærit sua dogmata quisque
Invenit, et pariter dogmata quisque sua.”

Men make their own opinions, and get them fixed in their minds, and then look for them in the Books of Nature and Revelation, where of course they find them. And unless they have these opinions ready provided, it is of no use to look, for no man can seek unless he knows what he is looking for. And it may be added, if they have them ready provided, it is equally useless to look, for it is folly to seek what a man already has.

Yet in the temporal, as in the spiritual, world, it must be allowed that there is more than one kind of research. There is the search for what, though well known in itself, cannot at present be found—as when an old lady has mislaid her keys, or when a young cockney seeks the pea beneath the thimbles. But there is also the search for that which is at present undiscovered; and this is the great seeking which fires the fancy, inspires the will, and adds the final completion to the mind. Many will always be contented with a lower

kind of seeking; will think it enough to find what they are told to look for, and to look for it in the way they are ordered. They will find that persons have been kind enough to explore all roads for them, and to draw up a hand-book for every region. The traveller has only to take his Murray's hand-book, the meteorologist his Admiralty manual; he will be told what to observe at each step of his progress, and at each hour of the day. If he still feels his freedom fresh about him while he is cooped up with these fetters, and aspires to nothing beyond; if he does not consider it simply as a necessary education in accuracy, but thinks it the highest point to which he is called,—then it is abundantly clear that he will never advance beyond his teachers, never know more than Murray or the manual can tell him.

The science of physical research was not reduced to rules in the middle ages; if any rule at all had been laid down, I doubt not that it would have been something like Tertullian's rule for spiritual seeking; and discovery would have been, in name at least, reduced to a stock of recipes for making the Elixir of Life, or the Philosopher's Stone, as precise as Mrs. Glasse's directions for roasting pigs or boiling potatoes. But whatever the theory was, the practice was something widely different. In fact, the objects of search were so mysterious and unknown, that any precise mode of searching, however desirable it might be supposed to be, would have been impossible. The alchemists and wizards could not have had a very clear idea of the nature of the elixir or the stone which they spent their lives in seeking. The *lapis philosophicus* was

“ a stone,
And not a stone; a spirit, a soul, and a body:
Which if you do dissolve, it is dissolved;
If you coagulate, it is coagulated;
If you make it to fly, it flieth.”

And its virtue was such, that one part projected on a hundred or a thousand parts of any metal would turn them into the purest gold. While the elixir, the “flower of the sun,” would

“ confer honour, love, respect, long life;
Give safety, valour, yea and victory. . . .
Cure all diseases coming of all causes—
A month's grief in a day, a year's in twelve.”

This was the object of search; and the place where, and the manner how, it was to be sought are equally sublime. Roger Bacon tells us there were seven methods of procuring it, all of which agreed in requiring that the stone “should be projected into the sky, and again plunged into the abyss; and this

process was to be repeated till the son became father, and father son, and till body became spirit."

No one can complain of being cramped by too minute and particularised rules in this search; it is as free as the winds and waves; the method, in its fine frenzy rolling, wanders from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven, and back again into the abyss. You know neither what you are looking for, nor where to look for it. And yet, did the search lead to nothing? On the contrary, alchemy was the cradle of chemistry; the elixir was the seed of pharmacy; astrology was the vestibule of astronomy; and the dreams of mediæval magicians and story-tellers were the germs of the great inventions of our day. Friar Bacon, who recognises one of the most mighty of all natural forces in the modification which the human voice impresses on the air, and through the air on the wood, or iron, or body or soul on which the speaker wishes to operate,—Friar Bacon, who thus was as great a wizard as Michael Scott, and fully as capable of nursing the secret of "the words that cleft Eildon Hills in three" as an unutterable mystery, promises his disciples that they shall do greater works than any which magic can effect,—that they shall make "ships without oars that shall go faster with only one steersman to manage than if they were full of sailors,—carriages drawn by no beast that shall move with inconceivable speed (as, he says, the ancient scythed-chariots are supposed to have been),—flying machines, with a man in the middle to flap the wings,—little instruments a few inches square that will raise indefinite weights, by which a man may escape out of prison, or drag a thousand struggling men,—also instruments for walking on the water, or for diving to the bottom. For Alexander the Great used such instruments, and whatever has been may be again." These anticipations, which Bacon founds on history, but upon history which had no foundation but a fancy as wild as that which invented the story of Sinbad the Sailor, seem like prophecies when read by the light of modern discoveries. Would Friar Bacon have been able to make them, think you, if he had confined himself to the strict rules of investigation, if he had been obliged to define the object and the method of his search before he began it? No; ignorance must be allowed to dream, or it will never come to know.

I go in, therefore, for the loosest and most liberal interpretation of our great charter—every one that seeks finds. Not that he always finds what he seeks, or his finding would often be of very little use to him; not that he is never disappointed, for that would be contrary to the rule of our

existence: there are more blanks than prizes in all lotteries, and most blanks in the lottery of life. It is often the case that we shoot and hit nothing; sometimes we shoot at a pigeon and kill a crow, and now and then we are lucky enough to shoot at a crow and hit a pigeon,—as Saul went out for his father's asses, and found a throne. But this varied success of our search does not depend upon the rules by which we search, but upon luck. All methods of search are successful in their turn; there is no infallible rule for discovery. *Tous les chemins mènent à Rome.* The Malays have a theory that the ocean is an infinite plain of water studded at intervals with islands; therefore, if they start in any given direction, and advance long enough in the same line, they are sure to find land at last; thus they have colonised the islands of the Pacific. Would they have done so if they had never started till they knew whither they were bound? Doubtless there were plenty of starved crews of emigrants which never came to land: but history records nothing about them, and I will not trouble myself with their fate; they only hastened by a few years their appointed end. They found something, if it was not what they sought. I do not deny that he who gropes in the dark often lights upon that he would not. Neither do I deny that there are foolish ways of seeking, which we cannot expect to be rewarded. It would be a blind search to look for a goose in the oil-pot, fat hogs in Jewry, or wine in a fishing-net; but you might find oil in the can, fish in the net, and fleas in Jewry. There are plenty of chances every where; many things grow in all gardens that were never sown there; and if the good dog sometimes goes dinnerless, in the mouth of the bad dog there not seldom falls a good bone.

The fatal objection to all philosophies of discovery is, that they fetter the free fancy, they discourage the ideal, and only allow a man to seek that which he has beforehand. They tend to improve the manner of our possession, but they do not increase its extent. They lead to accuracy, to fresh applications, to ease in manufacture, to plentiful supply; but they destroy the artistic, the ideal, the free scope of the fancy and of the intellect. And gradually and surely, when this is destroyed, the other arts become almost useless. As a jewel of gold in a swine's snout, so are the triumphs of European genius and fancy in the hands of the Chinaman: he may be a handy worker, he may be a successful producer, and an eager trader; but he is perfectly contented with what he has, he has no ideal object in view, and therefore his nation, though it numbers one-fourth of the human race, is without

influence in the world, and has sunk down into the most dismal intellectual condition. So again, compare the Arabs, as they exist now in Algeria and Morocco, splendid men to look at, dignified, grave, and majestic; great gentlemen, satisfied that their race and religion are the flower of the world, and that all others are but chaff in comparison; hating labour, not only as pain, but as a degradation; living by impulse, and satisfying their present wants with a lordly indifference to consequences, either to themselves or others; but squalid, false, and cruel, not only incapable of mounting the stairs of civilisation, but refusing to be helped up;—compare these men, who have no ideal before them but to wait upon fate, and to expect the “Lord of the hour” to come and deliver them, with their ancestors the first sons of the Prophet,—fevered fanatics, who propagated their faith with the cimeter, reigned in Spain, invaded France, devastated Italy, and erected the Alhambra; founded the Spanish schools; and taught Aristotle’s philosophy, Ptolemy’s astronomy, and Euclid’s geometry, to the European races. For then the Arabs had an ideal before them; and though this ideal was only that of a universal empire, in such grand dreams the sword does not count for all, the claims of mind and thought are not altogether unattended to. Mrs. S. C. Hall has a pleasant tale wherein an old Irishman is represented “watching for the time” in perfect indolence and placid expectancy. In Sam Slick’s Sketches there is a similar loiterer, who is contrasted forcibly with the go-ahead dash of the Clockmaker, who by his own energy of character rescues the idler from his fatal lethargy. These dreamers perhaps had an ideal, but it was rather the ideal of the romance-reader, who waits for the knight who is to come and purloin her, without moving hand or foot to hasten his coming, than the ideal of the romance-writer, whose dream of the loves of the heroes is capped by a more golden vision of profit and fame. We may be passive dreamers, or active. The passive dream leaves nothing but an impression; the active dream leaves a resolve behind, and thus becomes a prophecy which fulfils itself. If men would honestly tell us their dreams, I dare say that we might restore the lost art of oneiromancy, and guess shrewdly enough what the dreamer would attempt to do. Your dry philosopher is apt to overlook the scientific importance of the mystical element in our nature which gives birth to these dreams. But without it I doubt whether science would ever have been born. We have seen how the anticipations of Roger Bacon were founded on his conceptions of history, and how this history was founded on nothing but the romantic

fancy of the story-tellers. Here at least the paternity of science is not doubtful. And in general I think it likely that the pursuit of the ideal is mixed up with a reminiscence, traditional or fanciful, of the primitive state of man, and with a conception of the great plan and object of human life that begins with paradise and ends with the millennium. Any thing that we think has been, we must think may be again, and the best historians may be the truest prophets. In this sense, we may accept the saying of Halifax, that the first requisite for the prophet is a good memory,—not merely the selfish memory that will keep him consistent amidst contradictions, but the great secular memory which is a storehouse of the changes of the world. “Knowledge,” said Plato, “is but an awakening of memories.” A dream that is altogether new does not even solicit the practical faculties to attempt to realise it; a dream that is accompanied by the conviction that it once has been realised may easily drive the dreamer to attempt to realise it again. And for this reason, I much doubt whether the true men of progress are not those who, like Burke, are perpetually recurring to the wisdom of our ancestors, rather than those who, like Bright, coldly depreciate all ages in comparison of that in which they live. The present is the commonplace; the future is a void; in the past all ideals find their true home; and he who has not an object of admiration in the past is scarcely likely to have an ideal object of pursuit for the future, except perhaps some object moulded on the present and embodying all its vulgarity and materialism. For unless the ideal is composed out of the elements of the past, it can have no grandeur about it.

The pursuit of the ideal has been as remarkable in politics as in science, and though the political ideal has never been realised like the scientific ideal, the pursuit of it has determined the course of history. The Papal system of states as conceived by the great mediæval Popes, which is now being traced in the pages of this Review, is an instance. The modern European ideal of the balance of power is another case in point;—never perfectly realised, always advancing society a step on its appointed path. In like manner, all the attempts at universal empire,—the Persian invasions of Europe, the Eastern expedition of Alexander, the great empire of the Romans, the struggles of the German Emperors, the accomplished purposes, and far more the dreams, of Napoleon,—were all intended to reach an ideal, and all broke down, but have carried the germs of ideas and institutions into the places where they were wanted for God’s design, as birds carry the

seeds of plants across continents and seas, then drop them where they become the fathers of new forests.

In like manner, different political principles or habits have been at different times proclaimed to be the universal remedy for all public evils. At one time it is liberty, at another nationality, then equality, then brotherhood, then socialism. Not one of these ideas ever was, or ever can be, wholly realised; but they can perform a part in the world. Plato's Republic was impossible, so was More's Utopia, so is the Icarie of the French socialists; but men who set these ideals before them as a rule of conduct can impress the age, can divert the current of thought and of action, and can give a character to a century.

The pursuit of the geographical ideal has left still clearer footsteps on the map. It has at one time driven men north to seek the amenities of the hyperborean regions; Cathay and El-dorado have drawn men with as strong a physical attraction as the suspended thistle draws the donkey. The Spaniards thronged to America for its gold and silver, and bestowed on its inhabitants all the Catholic civilisation that they have got. The ideal has been to nations like the star which the Magi followed. The star of the Germanic nations first led them northward, and then took them south, till they had found and seized their allotted place; for all great nations have conquered their homes.

But here comes a difficulty. There is a perpetual inequality between the real and the ideal; the ideal is never realised. When, therefore, shall a man cease his pilgrimage? when shall he say, this is a sufficient fulfilment of my wishes, this is enough to content me? When is a man to accept, and when is he to refuse, the proffered instalment of his hopes? He who will never accept the real because it is still too far from the ideal, condemns himself to everlasting labour and perpetual failure, and is only paving the road of despair. It is sometimes the clearest evidence of strength of mind to take what you can get, however inadequate it may seem. The sailor does not abandon his ship because he cannot command the winds, nor does he change his destination because the winds are not favourable; he makes the best of what is actually given him. The preacher does not consign all his flock to Satan because they are not converted by his first sermon. The politician, when he finds that he cannot make things go well, tries to make them go as little ill as possible. He knows that

"all success
Proves partial failure; all advance implies

What's left behind ; all triumph, something crushed
At the chariot-wheels ; all government, some wrong."

But, on the other side, to be ready to accept the first offer, to rest from your pilgrimage, and to build your house on the first oasis you find, is to have too weak a hold of the ideal. About nineteen centuries ago, it is said, there was a tradition in China, that a great prince, the lord of the coming age, was born in the West ; ambassadors were sent, who met the first Buddhist missionaries on their way to China. The ambassadors were satisfied ; India was west enough for them ; Fo was prince enough to satisfy their ideal ; and they returned to curse their country with the religion of annihilation and of dreams. About the same time other wise men set out from another region of the dreamy East, and followed a star which led them to Bethlehem ; they also sought a Prince surrounded with the pomp of royalty, and they found and recognised their Ideal under the rags of the meanest poverty. So is it ever in the search for the ideal ; there are some who seem to succeed at once, but their fortune is the grossest failure ; there are others who go farther and appear to fare worse, and are obliged at last to put up with a mere apology for that which their high hopes had promised them—but they have succeeded. Those who set out from the land of dreams, and follow the star which seems to promise them a splendid empire in the land of realities, must both hope too high to be led aside by the first phantom that invites them, and must also mix with their hopes the humility which will neither refuse to recognise the monarch without his robes, nor be scandalised at apparent poverty and weakness where they expected riches and strength, if only the germ of what they sought lies hidden within.

Without an ideal to pursue, men will never labour long and heartily ; with too great an attachment to their own ideal, they will never effect any thing, for they will always despise the practicable in their aspirations for the impossible. They must aim at the impossible in order to hit the possible, but they must be quick to recognise the possible when it comes into view. He who wishes to excite a people to action must always promise more than he has to give. It is not only the French who fight for an idea ; any nation would refuse to contend for the merely practicable, with all its costliness and all its drawbacks, if it could be displayed beforehand. No people would consent to carry on a war of scepticism ; there must be enthusiasm, the imagination must be excited, there must be an idea. The Emperor must promise to drive the Austrians over the Alps, or into the Adriatic, if

he wishes to raise a power strong enough to drive them behind the Mincio. The Liberator must go in for repeal, when he would be overjoyed at a far different measure of "justice." So now the leaders in Ireland must agitate for the total suppression of the national system, though perhaps they know that they may after all have to content themselves with its reform, with the correction of its abuses, and with what improvements they can extort.

The people, therefore, must always be gulled; they will not act except upon impulse: the popular ballad says, "in the folly lies the pleasure; wisdom always makes it less." It is wise to moderate our expectations, and to be ready for disappointment; but it is not the way to move the masses. Even if they can be moved for a moderate measure, it is almost lost labour to move them; their very success disbands them again. When we hope high, every success, however great, is but a partial accomplishment of our aspirations. There still remains a goodly measure of unfulfilled hope. If we pitch our hopes low, success leaves us hopeless; we have no farther object in life but to relapse into the sleepy state of the Chinaman. Human activity is a more desirable end than any material result of that activity. The child takes salt to put on the bird's tail; he catches no birds, but he gets what is much better, health and strength and rosy cheeks, and so falsifies Pope's maxim, that "none can compass more than they intend." The pursuit of any object is usually felt to be so good in itself that men are disappointed with too rapid a success:

*"Nolo quod cupio statim tenere,
Nec victoria mihi placet parata."*

It is good, then, to propose an ideal, if only with the object of rousing people to activity, even though we have no real hopes of attaining what we propose.

But in thus raising expectations and getting up a cry, several risks are run; there is always danger in humbugging our fellow-creatures; and though we were too sure of our friends to fear their turning against us for disappointing them, yet there are always enemies to be feared. If there was but one party, one set of interests in the world, the only object of leaders would be to get this party to work; any cry, any idea, that would suffice to rouse them would fulfil its destiny. But when there are two parties, two conflicting interests, the cry that will excite one is always sure to react upon the other. It should, then, be a question for the leaders whether the action which they invite, or the reaction which they provoke, is likely to be the strongest and most lasting. The man com-

mits an unpardonable blunder who collects a mob, inflames it with hot speeches, exalts it upon tall words, buckrams it with loud resolutions, and sends it home to do nothing; and at the same time provokes the jealousy of an active and hostile band to take effectual measures to retain the unfair advantages against which his agitation was commenced. It would be a very ill result of an enthusiastic meeting at St. James's Hall if it only established a hostile committee at Exeter Hall to thwart all its resolutions.

The pursuit of the ideal is no easy matter; to follow a phantom with the hope of attaining it,—for if we hope not, we shall not stir a foot,—and yet to be conscious that it is a phantom; to keep before the mind its shadowy, vaporous consistence in such a way as to be ready to turn aside from it to secure any solid advantages that present themselves on the way, and yet to have enough faith in its solidity and reality to make us beware how we stop and pick up the golden apples that are dropped on our path to allure us aside; to remember who mistook the shadow for the meat in the fable, and yet not to sell our reversion to the splendid shadow at too low a price,—all this requires prudence and judgment as well as strength of imagination—a combination rare at all times, rarest perhaps now.

A TRUE REPORT OF THE LIFE AND MARTYRDOM
OF MR. RICHARD WHITE, SCHOOLMASTER.*

I HAVE received your letters (my dear friends) dated the 17th day of November, wherein you renew your old suit unto me to lay down in a brief discourse the lingering martyrdom of Mr. Richard White, the which had been done before this day, had I not hoped that some other man of greater skill and experience would take in hand so good a matter, answerable to the weight and worthiness thereof; but understanding that those who are better able than myself to do it are either employed to other business of greater importance that they can have no leisure, or else hindered by the iniquity of the time that they can have no opportunity, I have presumed here, as it were with a coal,

* The following is printed from a contemporary Ms. that was found some time ago in the Mission House of the Catholic Chapel, Holywell. It agrees in the main with the long account of the death of the "Protomartyr of Wales" given by Dr. Bridgewater (from which Dr. Challoner drew up his brief memoir), but is an independent production, entering into many more details than are given in the published account.

rudely to draw the portraiture of his great patience and constancy, rather than that the memory of so glorious a martyr should perish, referring the polishing and painting thereof in colours to a more cunning workman.

Therefore you shall understand that he was born at Llanydlos in Montgomeryshire, and descended of honest parentage, bearing the surname of Gwin; but after his coming to the University, some of his acquaintance, perceiving the Welsh word to signify *White* in English, termed him White, by the which name he was ever afterward known and called. Of his younger years there is nothing memorable, saving that he was twenty years of age before he did frame his mind to like of good letters; at which years, following the counsel of the wise philosopher (who saith), *quod nunquam sera est ad bonos mores via*, he gave his mind to repair to such places as he knew most famous for learning.

Imitating
herein the
example of
Plato.

First he travelled to Oxford, where he made no great abode; from thence he resorted to Cambridge, and there made choice of St. John's College, where he lived by the charity of the said College, and chiefly of Dr. Bullock, then head of the household, his very good benefactor. But when alteration of religion compelled sundry principal men of both Universities to leave their rooms and livings, the said Dr. Bullock, amongst the rest, left also his house and country. Afterwards, a new governor being placed in his stead "who knew not Joseph," need and poverty compelled this young man to become a teacher before he could perfectly lay the foundation to be a learner; and when he had bestowed some few years in the University, God put in his mind, by persuasion of friends, to return towards his own country; and so he placed himself in Maclor, where he bestowed his poor talent among the youths of that country, and in the end his life and blood for their further benefit. A happy return to the whole country, if the miserable blind people would consider of it; much they are beholden unto him for the offices of his life, but much more for his glorious death and martyrdom.

Exod. i. 8.

Bromefield
in Den-
highshire.

The whole time he remained there was about sixteen years, the which he so divided that all Maclor and every part thereof might fare the better by him. First, he placed himself in Orton Madock, where he spent most of these years; from thence he removed to Wrexham (where he spent his life as you shall understand hereafter), and so he went to Gresford, then to Yswyd, and last of all to Orton again; by reason of which public charge in all these places he was greatly

acquainted, his company of the better sort much desired, and of the people generally loved for his diligence in teaching and other good parts known to be in him. His moderation and temperance in his life and conversation were such, that his adversaries could never to this day charge him with any notable crime, or any other fault than the following of his faith and conscience (which nowadays is accounted madness), for testimony whereof I appeal to those places where he hath conversed. During this while he so profited by his own private study in knowledge of good literature, that it was wonder to them that knew him before to see in the man so great ripeness from so late a beginning. He was not unskilful in most of the liberal sciences, and in histories very well seen; but now in his latter time he gave his time wholly to the study of divinity: as for his knowledge in the Welsh tongue, he was inferior to none in his country, whereto he hath left to posterity some precedent in writing, eternal monuments of his wit, zeal, virtue, and learning. A little before his coming to Orton this latter time, he married thence a young girl, by whom he had six children, whereof he sent three to heaven before him in their infancy; the other three he left with their mother. And so being the second time placed in Orton among his wife's friends, Mr. Downam, the named bishop of Chester, and his officers began to molest him for refusing to receive at their communion-table. In the end, after some troubles, he yielded to their desires, although greatly against his stomach, by the earnest persuasion of a gentle-
man, who had him then, and hath now a great part
of that country at command; and lo, by the providence of God, he was no sooner come out of the church but a fearful company of crows and kites so persecuted him to his home that they put him in great fear of his life, the conceit whereof made him also sick in body as he was already in soul diseased; in the which sickness he resolved himself (if God would spare him life) to become a Catholic, the which good purpose, afterward having recovered his health, he performed accordingly.

But the enemy of mankind, envying his well-doing, and fearing lest the example of so good a man, being a public person, would do much harm to his cause, incited the minds of such as were (in the parish) before infected with heresy to molest him, who never gave over their malice until they had banished him out of the country and diocese. From thence he went over the river of Dee unto Erbistock, where, in an old barn, he exercised still his former profession of teaching; but the spiteful heretics

Roger
Puleston.

He is pre-
sented.

made means to expel him thence also, and to despatch him at length out of the whole country; for, indeed, they were unworthy to have among them so blessed a man.

Then he travelled abroad to seek relief and comfort among strangers which was denied him by his own countrymen at home, who were most beholden unto him. In the end it pleased God to deliver him to the hands of his adversaries, in that town where he afterwards suffered.

His first
apprehen-
sion in
Wrexham.

The next day after his apprehension being Thursday, the justices of the peace met in the said town to determine of him; in the mean time the prisoner escaped, for that Thursday was not yet come wherein, in the

His second
apprehen-
sion in July
1580.

same place, he should glorify God by his constant death. And before two years were expired he was apprehended again by one David Edwards, a mer-

cer, not far from the place whence he had made his escape, who laid violent hands on him in the highway, having neither commission from superior magistrates nor any special quarrel with the party himself, but of a foolish blind zeal, being a hot Puritan, and of spiteful hatred to the man's religion. Now the servant of God having the second time fallen into the hands of his enemies, was first carried to the mercer's house (who took him), and both

Siambar
ddu.

This gen-
tleman was
a continual
enemy to
the prison-
er, and busy
at his in-
dictment,
but never
lived to see
his death,
ending his
own life
miserably.

His usage
at
Ruthin.

John Salus-
bury of
Rûg.

his legs were loaded with heavy bolts. Afterward conveyed to the black chamber, a vile and filthy prison, where he lay on the cold ground two days and two nights; fed, &c.; thence brought before Robert Puleston to be examined, who (being an enemy to the Catholic religion) returned his commitment for vehement suspicion of treason; so he was sent to Ruthin (for there the gaol remained), both arms being made sure with strong handbolts, where, at his first coming, the gaoler entertained him with a huge pair of bolts on both heels, the which continued the first quarter. Marry, towards the second quarter, the gaoler being now better acquainted with the man's behaviour and innocency, remitted some part of his former rigour towards him. And here I may not omit to tell you a strange accident which chanced to a gentleman of good account in the country a little after the prisoner's coming to town, who, passing by the gaol in company with one Goodman, Dean of Westminster, and perceiving the prisoner to stand in the door, first paused a while beholding him, then shook his head upon him, saying, "Oh, White, White, thou art an unprofitable member of the com-

monwealth!" the which words he spake in hearing of this preacher, to maintain a little credit he was in with him and other heretics, but plainly against his own conscience and knowledge; for all the country knew him to be inclined in mind unto the same religion for the which the other man sustained imprisonment and irons even in his presence. But see what followed: the gentleman returned home sick, and was never seen abroad after this word until he came to be buried; a sore word to the man himself, and a good example to all dissemblers, especially in credit and authority, to take heed what they say or do against their own conscience. Another chance happened, no less strange than the former, unto a preacher, one Ithel Thelwell, son to Simon Thelwell (who afterward, as you shall hear, pronounced sentence of death upon the martyr). This minister, being Master of Arts and a preacher of no small account, having entered unto his sermon (before the judges and all the worship of the shire, in the assize week, which he had no doubt provided against the Catholic religion and this holy confessor), suddenly fell dumb, that the judges themselves were fain to call him out of the pulpit with shame enough; whereupon there wanted not some who affirmed that Mr. White had bewitched him; but many reported that this good man's imprisonment was the cause of the preacher's dumbness. But what think you? were the magistrates moved with the sight hereof to take compassion on their prisoner? Nothing less: "Induratum enim erat cor Pharaonis ne demitteret Israel,"—Israel should not depart.

A preacher
struck
dumb.

Exod. x.

In this first assize, kept at Ruthin about Michaelmas A.D. 1580, he had not much said to him, saving that the judges were earnestly in hand with him to accuse his benefactors and forsake his religion, wherein God so assisted him that they could not prevail. Towards Christmas, the gaol was removed unto Wrexham, where a new gaoler received him with a great pair of shackles, the which he was compelled to wear both day and night all the year following, by the special commandment of the sheriff, an enemy to all good men, and namely to this man of God, even to his last breath and after.

The first
assize
kept at
Ruthin.

Owen
Brereton.

Now the second assize being kept at Wrexham, in May A.D. 1581, the adversaries were busy to make him relent, so far at the least as to hear an heretical sermon, for they did imagine that his fall would give the Catholic religion a sore blow, especially in Maelor, where the people depended much upon his virtue and learn-

The second
assize at
Wrexham.

ing. But when the magistrates saw that fair means and gentle persuasions could take no place, they began to extend towards him plain violence; for presently six of the sheriff's men were commanded to carry him unto the church, who took the servant of God upon their shoulders, with his heels

He is carried to the church upon men's shoulders.

upward, and so bare him in procession-wise round about the font (a very strange spectacle to the beholders), laying him along under the pulpit, where a preacher was ready to welcome the poor man with a railing sermon. But all this while he

Thomas Jones.

so stirred his legs that with the noise of his irons the preacher's voice could not be heard; whereat the judges and sheriff were in a great rage, commanding to carry him thence into the stocks; but he told them that it needed not, for he offered to go with them quietly to any punishment for his conscience, yea to the gallows, if they would have it; but to their schismatical assemblies, he told them, he would never go or come quietly. And thus he was locked in the stocks, by both legs, from ten o'clock before noon until eight at night, vexed all the time with a rabble of ministers.

In the end he was turned loose toward his gaol, halting all the way as he went by reason of stiffness in his legs overcharged with stocks and fetters, which rueful spectacle the

The lewd nature of an heretic.

mercier beholding brake forth into a great laughter; a lewd nature of a malicious heretic, to feed himself in such wicked malice upon the cruel affliction

of the poor man. In the mean time the magistrates, consulting how they might collect matter enough out of that day's work to make him away, caused a jury to be empannelled, men for their own purpose, haters of the Catholic faith, to whom was no store made of his demeanour in the church, and words to the justices. But the jury perceiving that the evidence against him did not bear weight, found the bill for a disturbance of divine service; and thereupon he

He is indicted in a hundred marks.

was fined by Judge Bromley in a hundred marks; a most wicked verdict and sentence against all law of God and man; and a pretty stratagem, first to do open violence to his body, and then to bring him under the danger of their law; I dare say contrary to the intention of the law-makers themselves, who could not conceive a man in his case violently carried to their

The statute against disturbers of divine service.

church upon men's shoulders. Well, howsoever they conceive, I am sure that many who were present at this device complained of the injustice done unto him that day, the which even God Himself,

to the honour of His servant, showed presently before the bar, by an evident miracle; for when James Garm, the pronotary, or primitary, should have read the bill of his indictment, he was stricken blind, as we read of Elymas the sorcerer to have been by the sentence of St. Paul; and whereas the judge called upon him twice or thrice to read the bill, the said pronotary, opening his breast in a great rage, confirmed with an oath that he was stark blind; whereunto Sir George replied, "Speak softly, lest the Papists make a miracle of that." And thus the bill was turned over to be read by another clerk that stood by.

The pronotary is stricken blind.
Acts xiii.

Obstinacy with great blindness and partiality in a judge.

The assize being kept at Denbigh in September following, there was no great matter done against him, saving that Sir George Bromley caused him to be indicted in seven score pounds for not coming to church, upon the penal statute of twenty pounds a month, then lately enacted; a ridiculous thing that a poor man lying close prisoner many years together, and at the command of his gaoler, should notwithstanding be guilty of the statute before it was devised. But equity and conscience can have no place where corrupt and blind affection reigneth. After that he was fined in this double mulct,—viz. at the assizes before in a hundred marks for coming to church, and at this assize in two hundred marks for not coming,—it pleased Mr. Justice to play and sport with his prisoner (as the cat doth with the mouse before she devour it), pleasantly demanding of him what he had to discharge himself of his debt; whereunto Mr. White, very devoutly making low obeisance, answered, "I have somewhat towards it." "What hast thou?" sayeth the justice. "I have," sayeth he, "sixpence;" the which answer did set Sir George in such a rage that nothing might cool the same until he beheld the poor man's legs well charged with two pair of irons, for fear belike of running away, now being so much in the queen's debt. Some which were present at this talk reproved the prisoner for crossing Mr. Justice, being he knew well that the man could never abide to be crossed; some were of a contrary mind, allowing his answer as proceeding from the wise man's counsel, who biddeth answer a fool according to his foolishness, that he may not seem wise in his own conceit. To tell you mine opinion, I think that the demand was beside all wit and discretion to ask a poor prisoner, who depended on the devotion and charity of others, what he had to discharge 300 marks and odd money.

The third assize kept at Denbigh.

A wise question.

This confessor's jesting proceedeth from a sincere and quiet conscience.

He weareth double irons.

At this assize John Hughes and Robert Moris, his fellows, were first committed to prison with him, who had long before his apprehension sustained irons for the same cause at the council in the Marches, and were now removed to their own country, no doubt by the special providence of God, to receive mutual comfort one of the other, and especially to learn of this blessed confessor the rules of perfect charity, patience, devotion, and all other acts of virtue.

The next assize, kept at Wrexham in the year 1582, the adversaries having learned the experience in the same place a twelvemonth before, that forced haling of the prisoner to sermons could take no good end, devised another stratagem more cunning than the former, but with as ill success: for upon Friday in the assize week, at about four of the clock in the afternoon, the prisoners were sent for to the bar, where, beside their expectation, a minister was ready to entertain them with an heretical sermon, of the which wrong they ceased not to complain to the judges, telling them that they came not thither to hear sermons, but to receive law and justice. Marry, their complaint taking no place, they turned their speech to the preacher, the one in Latin, the other in English, and the third in Welsh, so fast that the magistrates were not a little offended with them, threatening them, if they would not give over, heavy bolts, whips, stocks, dungeons, and pillory; to be short, the prisoners were removed in no small displeasure, and the preacher made an end of his lying sermon with small grace.

In this assize certain pedlars and tinkers, who then bare some sway in the town, hot Puritans and full of the gospel, complained upon the sheriff that he was not so sharp to his prisoners as they required, yea, moreover, in plain terms, that he relieved them; an heinous offence (if it were true), and worthy punishment, that a magistrate should give such an open example as to do a deed of charity,—if it be a deed of charity to relieve poor Papists; for, except I mistake, the Protestant preachers have found out of late in their new divinity that Christian men are bound to relieve felons and murderers in prison, or any other malefactor, but not Papists; and this Christopher Goodman teacheth and practiseth at West Chester, where he taketh special order that the poor Catholics in the castle may reap no benefit by the poor man's box and other relief which is in the city gathered for prisoners; whereby may appear that all is not the word of the Lord (whereof these fellows brag so

The fourth
assize kept
at Wrex-
ham.

At Easter
none was
admitted
to the com-
munion-
table but
such as had
a token
from one of
the two
tinkers.

much) that cometh out of their mouths, but they are glad now and then to drop among it some of their own words and inventions: and this by the way; now to the matter.

Upon this complaint presently order was laid down by the judges that Mr. Sheriff must have four overseers to assist him, who so narrowly looked to their charges that all access of their friends unto them was barred, except of their wives only; and they were not suffered to bring them any relief at all but these honest men must oversee it; the which strange dealing did drive into the people's heads such a mutiny, that every man affirmed how their adversaries did mean to despatch the poor man by famine whom they could not make away by any colour of law. And here I may not forget to tell you the notable malice that David Edwards, the mercer before named, one of the said overseers, bare this man of God; who, being on horseback ready to take his journey, and beholding the prisoner to stand at the gaol-door in his irons, with his little child in his arms, suddenly the spiteful wretch, as one in some frantic mood, crossed the way towards him, and in a great rage overthrew him backwards on the stones, leaving the print of his nails in his face, putting also the babe in no small hazard of his life. But what think you? durst he complain hereof to the judges? Or could he hope to find any remedy at their hands? Nothing less. The good man laid up this injury among others more, to be remedied by a more indifferent Judge, who would no doubt one day, and could, remedy the same. Another like token of a malicious heart this desperate heretic showed about the same time, causing his wife and daughter to depose before Jevan Lloyd of Yale that the prisoner was seen two flight-shots from the gaol (naming the place); the which his gaoler disproved to their faces, affirming that one Jevan Lewis was the man, and not he. Where you may see what malice can do in a wicked mind, void of God's fear, conscience, religion, and all goodness. Verily, if justice might have taken place; the pillory, which was a little before threatened (as you have heard) to the innocent man and his fellows, should have been the reward of these perjured women, for whom and for such it was chiefly ordained.

The Michaelmas following our prisoners were removed to the Holt (where the assize was kept),

Tinkers
aggravate
matters
against the
prisoners.
The sheriff
was one Mr.
Edward
Hughes, of
the Holt.
Four over-
seers,
whereof
Vicar Son-
ley and
David Ed-
wards were
two.

The cruelty
of an
heretic.
Oh, cursed
caitiff!
more inhu-
man than
Turk or
heathen.

Jury of two
women.

Coytmor.

Well may
these evan-
gelical
brethren
brag of
their only
faith; for
they have
not one
dram of
charity
among
them.

to be there indicted of high treason, as appeareth by a letter
The fifth assize kept at Holt. that Mr. White wrote himself to a friend of his,
 the copy whereof I have laid down *verbatim* as
 followeth :

The Copy of Mr. White his Letter, reporting the indictment of the three prisoners at the Holt, and the manner of their adversaries' proceeding against them.

“ After my hearty commendations, these are to certify you of our estate. Upon Friday in the assize week we were indicted of high treason by the great inquest, Owen Brereton being foreman, by the procurement of David Edwards, Sir Hugh Sonlley the apostata, David Powell Goch, Vicar of Ruabon, who did follow the bill against us (as far as I could understand) ; for Mr. Justice Townsend demanding who followed the bill, the clerk of the indictment gave answer, David Powell, and he then stood at the bar. Sir Hugh Sonlley and David Edwards had gotten one Lewis Gronow, of Miriadock in this county of Denbigh (who was prisoner with us for an execution debt), to bear witness against us, the which Lewis had been on the pillory at Denbigh by the procurement of Mr. Tudur Probert. This honest man, being examined before the two judges, Jevan Lloyd of Yale, Roger Puleston, Owen Brereton, and others, deposed that we three had persuaded him and divers others to abstain from the church, and to acknowledge the Pope's authority ; and that he had to prove this sundry witnesses, whom he named to them : as David Penrhun, Peter Roydon, John Roberts Barker of Ruthin, and Edward Eccles, who were all in our gaol at several times. David Penrhun did not appear ; the rest were deposed, who upon their oaths cleared us, and proved our adversary perjured. Moreover, one Robert Clarke, minister of Wrexham, deposed that he heard John Roberts Barker, before named, report how David Penrhun did tell him that I did call the church *domum diaboli* ; the which John Roberts denied upon his oath, and so the minister was fore-sworn. Again, there was two gentleman in our gaol for an execution, Mr. Thomas Price Winne of Llanarmon in Yale, and Thomas Lloyd of Abergeley, who offered to depose that Lewis Gronow was in hand with them to bear false witness against me ; but they cried on him in these words, ‘ Fie on thee, fie on thee ! thou, being an old man ninety years of age, and wouldst thou have us bear false witness with thee against any man ? ’ In the afternoon the second inquest was called, which went upon life and death. In the mean time John Hughes his wife was examined strictly, to get more evidence for the last inquest ; but nothing could be gotten. Here the gaoler had a great charge given him by Sir George to look well unto us three ; and so he bound our arms behind our backs with cords, and watched us in the shire-hall all the day fasting, that we looked for present death the next day after. At length the second inquest came in far in the night with their verdict, and said nothing of us. And this is

Lewis Gronow
 now a
 perjurer.

A minister
 a perjurer.

all I can certify at this time. What shall become of us God knoweth, unto whom we commit ourselves and you, with commendations from my fellows, desiring the assistance of your prayers and other good friends for us. Wrex., the 12 of October Anno Dom. 1582. Your daily beadsman,

RICH. WHITE."

At this assize a lamentable chance happened unto a gentleman of good calling, who had been a Catholic and a great benefactor to these prisoners, and was now brought by infirmity and importunity of carnal friends to renounce his faith before the bar, with open protestation; a pitiful example never heard of in Wales before, and no small discomfort to the poor prisoners. But what followed? The gentleman returned home, his soul loaded with sin, his conscience with desperation, his body with punishments so strange and fearful that my tongue doth tremble to utter them, my heart doth bleed to think upon them; but the country doth remember them, and the posterity will talk of them—how far better had it been for him to fall into the hands of men, from whom many ways he might have escaped, at least by death, than to fall into the terrible hands of Almighty God, from whose fingers he might neither dead nor alive escape. Alas, that the constancy of his poor beadsmen could not stay him from so foul a deed, whom he beheld chained and bound hand and foot, ready to offer their lives and blood for that cause which he came to renounce and forsake. But I pray God, that his poor soul may not now answer for this dissimulation before that seat where all our actions must be discussed, where dissimulation can take no place, nor friendship prevail; and that his example may be a warning to other gentlemen to take heed of the like attempt.

At Christmas, after this assize, the new sheriff entering into his office, first removeth from the prisoners their overseers, being able of himself to oversee them sufficiently; then chargeth them with great irons, for the great good will he bare to them.

Jevan
Lloyd of
Yale.

At the assize in May 1583, order was taken for their removing to the council of the marches, the which was done with great solemnity, binding their arms fast behind them, *tanquam latrones cum fustibus et gladiis*, as their Master and Captain was sometimes brought before the high-priest. They hoped by torments to wrest from them some evidence against themselves, that they might after with more colour despatch them. Thither was brought to meet these prisoners two

The 6th as-
size kept at
Wrexham.

Matt. 26.

young men, prisoners also, from Flint gaol, to be tortured likewise for the same cause, Mr. John Benet and Harry Pue, the one a priest, the other a layman, both right virtuous and constant Catholics; who were all five in November following, at Bewdley and Bridgenorth, laid in the manacles (a kind of torture at the council, not much inferior to the rack at the Tower of London), whereof there is written a special treatise, collected out of divers letters from the said confessors to their friends, of which letters I have selected so much as concerneth our martyr, whereof this is the copy.

A Copy of a Letter sent from one of the Catholic prisoners to a friend of his, wherein he sheweth the torturing of himself and of his fellows at Bewdley, in Nov. Anno Dom. 1583.

“Being so often called upon to lay down particular notes of the council’s dealings towards us during the time of our trial and torments, I have collected such things as my fellows and myself could remember to satisfy your request, and conferred diligently therein with them again, lest any untruth had escaped us by overmuch haste in writing. Therefore you shall understand, that Sir George Bromeley sent for John Huges and Robert Moris before him, upon Tuesday, in the morning about eight of the clock, being the 26th of November, etc. The 27th day following, being about eight of the clock in the morning, Mr. Richard White and Harry Pue were brought to Atkins’s chamber, the Queen’s attorney, and all the way as they passed, the people lifted up their hands after them, saying, ‘God save you! God stand with you!’ When they were come before the attorney, he examined them awhile together; and being separated, the said attorney turned him to Mr. White, and said as followeth.

Atkins. I protest before God, that the principality of Wales is the third part of the realm wherein no punishment at all hitherto hath been used towards such lewd, obstinate, and disobedient persons; upon whom (as Mr. Justice sayeth) no more mercy ought to be had than on a mad dog, for all Papists be the Queen’s professed enemies.

White. You slander them; they are not; and for my part, I do acknowledge her to have full authority in all temporal causes within her own dominions, and so we are taught by our superiors.

A. You are contrary to your fellows herein, for Benet calleth the Pope *rex regum*, and he sayeth himself in his own style, *si non valeat verbum Domini valeat gladius Petri*.

W. As for Mr. Benet you have forthcoming, let him answer for himself; and as touching the Pope’s style, I know it not, but this that I have told you I believe to be true.

A. Wilt thou swear it?

W. Will you enlarge me if I do?

A. If thou wilt answer directly to such questions as we are

to demand of thee upon thy further reformation, although thou be indicted of treason, yet I will be a suitor for thee to the council, who shall be a means for thee to her Majesty to procure thy pardon. We will not charge thee with any point of religion, but of treason; we will not demand of thee how many sacraments there be, as the Papists did our men in Queen Mary's time, but we will demand of thee when thou hast been first reconciled, by whom, in what place, where hast confessed, how often, and whether thou hast been in confession with Benet or no, sithence he came to the country.

W. Do not you know that confession is a point of religion, and one of the chiefest, and in demanding of me such a question you break promise?

A. It is no point of religion at all, but the very invention of the Pope to draw subjects thereby from their prince to promise obedience to him, that he may displace the prince to enrich his own coffers. What thinkest thou, may he lawfully displace any prince of his kingdom?

W. He doth displace none.

A. Now how say you to the Bull of Pius Quintus against our most gracious Queen?

W. Notwithstanding that Bull (the which I never saw), I believe and confirm that she is our lawful Queen.

A. Doth not the Pope grant pardons and plenaries to such as will kill our Queen?

W. I deny that; for he neither doth so, nor yet will do so, nor can if he would.

A. He cannot indeed, but it is his common practice so to do: for the late rebels in the north, and Saunders in Ireland, had a Bull from the Pope to invade the realm, to murder the council and the Queen's royal person; and he hath to this end erected seminaries (as nurseries for all disobedient persons to run into), from whence do come those lewd runagate priests, who labour to seduce the people from their obedience to their prince, and to cause an uproar within the realm if it be not prevented in time.

A lie.

Another lie.

The third lie.

W. As for the rising in the north, I was not privy thereto, neither to Dr. Saunders going to Ireland, being prisoner at the very same time; therefore you do me wrong to charge me with other men's actions; and as touching the seminaries, I heard it reported that they have the Queen's arms upon their college at Rome, and that they use in both colleges a daily prayer for her Majesty.

A. They have the arms of England, but they do not mean the Queen of England; and as for their prayer, they pray, after their seditious manner, that she may be either converted or confounded, and so dost thou.

W. When I pray for her Majesty, I make her of no higher degree than a neighbour; for a man is bound to love God above all things, and his neighbour as himself: and I place her under the

highest degree of neighbourhood, contained in the commandment, Honour thy father and mother, &c., but I will not make her my God.

A. She is indeed *pater patriæ*. But to let these words pass, how say you to the premises? Will you answer us directly concerning your reconciliation and confession with Benet within these three weeks, as some of your own fellows do witness.

W. Doth not the Scripture say that the Pharisees and Sadducees came to St. John, confessing their sins and to be baptised?

A. Yes; but that was not auricular confession: peradventure thou wouldst recite another place in the 19th of the Acts (this place Mr. Benet had taught the attorney before), where it is said that the believers confessed their deeds to the Apostles.

And so in the end Mr. White was turned to the manacles about nine of the clock in the morning, upon which torture he was strictly examined by the aforesaid attorney upon the former interrogatives about his reconciliation and confession; who promised him that he should not be delivered from the torments until he would confess the truth. And moreover, he willed him to have regard to himself, being an old man, and not so able to endure the pains as some of his fellows were; and that some had confessed already, and were at ease, as he should be also, if he would do the like. But all these charming words could not prevail against the resolute soul of this constant confessor, who bestowed all the time of his torments in continual prayer, by craving of God for his tormentors mercy and forgiveness, and for himself safe deliverance from their malice by the merits of Christ Jesus His passion; and this he did with a loud voice. But the persecutors seemed to be tormented with his words, as if they had been possessed; for they never ceased running in and out all the while, muttering one to another he knew not what. Then he fell to prayer in silence, and so continued until dinner-time without any answer to their demands; whereat the pitiful men, moved no doubt with compassion, supposing the man to be speechless, took him down, and so left him to remain with his manacles until their coming again. Immediately after dinner came to visit the prisoner Mr. Justice Bromeley, Mr. Townsend, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Leighton of the Plash, Mr. Thelwall, being all of the council; Mr. Atkins, the attorney, Mr. Sherrer, Thomas Evans, deputy-solicitor, and divers others. Then Sir George Bromeley, as one in a great rage, uttered these words.

Bromeley. There is no more pity to be had on thee than on a mad dog; and it were better that all such wretches were hanged, than that the state of the realm should be troubled with the like. For it standeth us upon to look unto such, and we are so commanded by the Queen and the council; yea, if we had no authority from above, yet we might do it of ourselves.

W. Sir, if you have authority, either of yourselves or from others, I pray you, put me to death out of hand, and therein you shall do me greater pleasure than to kill me continually in these torments, the which I have felt all this day for my conscience.

B. Nay, thou shalt first be tormented, and then hanged afterwards; for thou art indicted of high treason, and I cannot help thee, unless upon thy reformation I stay the verdict of the quest, or else reprieve thee; and if thou wilt do no service to the Queen, if the quest refuse to cast thee, I will have them all to London; but if thou wilt detect and bewray such treasons as are to be asked of thee, we will do for thee, and if thou fear to lose thy benefactors, we will provide that thou shalt live as well as thou dost now; nay, not so neither, but thou shalt have a competent living to live withal. And if thou tell more than Robert Moris hath done, thou shalt be better looked unto; for he hath confessed already, and is now at ease.

W. *Etiam innocentes cogit mentiri dolor.*

Sherrer. Sir, he can work well in a garden; he hath sometimes been my man, and now he hath wife and children.

Phillips. If he will forsake his religion, he shall be my man and gardener too.

A. Indeed, I must say that he is more sensible, and can yield better reason for himself than Benet, who calleth the Pope *rex regum*, for he sayeth that the Pope hath a temporal sword in England.

B. Yea, that Benet, he had rather dispense with the Pope's laws, which are so far, than with the Queen's laws, which be so nigh.

W. The Pope is a priest, and he meddleth not with the temporal sword, which belongeth to kings and princes; for priests may not fight with the sword.

B. We are all kings and priests. Well, the time passeth away; if thou answer not directly about thy reconciliation and confession with Benet, &c., thou must needs go to the tortures again.

W. Where did you read in all the Scriptures that Christians did compel any by tortures to be of their religion? but we read that Christ whipped the unworthy out of the Temple.

B. It is written in the Gospel, 'Go out into the highways, and compel them to come in,' and so we do the like.

P. I pray, sir, to pardon him this time from the manacles until the morning.

B. Well, I am content; and now I pray thee, White, what didst thou give for thy wife?

W. Sir, that question is no point of religion.

And so the council, laughing, departed, and Mr. White was turned over to confer with Sherrer.

E. Sir, this man hath been confessed with Benet the priest within these three weeks, and there are witnesses against him of his own fellows, and yet he will not confess it.

S. What, dost thou deny a truth? he that denyeth a truth denyeth Christ, for Christ is the truth; thou denyest the truth, *ergo* thou denyest Christ!

W. I deny neither Christ nor the truth, because I say nothing.

S. To say nothing or to conceal a truth, is the denying of the truth.

W. Then this post denyeth the truth, for it saith nothing.

S. I am sorry with all my heart that I have spoken for thee, and make full account thou shalt to the tortures again.

And so Sherrer departed, and Mr. White remained in the same place with his manacles two long hours after, expecting when he should be laid in them again ; but God protected him from any further cruelty at that time.

[To be continued.]

Correspondence.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

SIR,—There are many reasons why the question of Catholic ecclesiastical education should be assuming special importance at the present day. The rapid increase in the number of our priests during the last few years ; the probability that, if the stream of conversions continues to flow, their ranks may be more largely recruited than has hitherto been the case from the higher classes of society ; and the prominence with which Catholic claims and interests are almost daily forcing themselves, in various shapes, on public notice,—these, and other reasons which might be mentioned, make it important to consider whether any modifications, and of what nature, are desirable in the system of our schools and colleges. As I am not writing an essay on the subject, but simply suggesting points for the consideration of those better qualified to judge, I shall make no apology for briefly jotting down a few questions that have occurred to my own mind, without of course professing to have exhausted their bearings, or to have met, in the brief compass of one letter, all the difficulties they may involve.

First, then, as regards the question of *separate* training for the clergy from boyhood, it seems to me that two questions may be raised, viz. how far it is *per se* desirable, and further, how far, if Catholicism should attain that social position in England which it is of course the prayer and desire of every Catholic that it speedily may, such a system would be even possible. I am far from saying that there would not be room for a St. Sulpice in England ; but I cannot help thinking that if the class of men who are trained for the Protestant ministry at our public schools and universities are to be enlisted for the service of the altar, a very different system from that of St. Sulpice would be found necessary, at least for many of them. But, to take the question on its abstract merits, is it altogether desirable that the line of demarcation should be rigidly drawn, and that at an early age ; even where vocations develop themselves thus early, which cannot surely *always* be the case ? The mixture of those

who are training for the Church with those who are preparing for the army, or the bar, or the medical profession, or the service of the state, is, I suppose, the main secret of the great moral and social influence of the Anglican clergy. Are we wise in altogether dispensing with such an advantage, even though we need it *in dealing with our own people* less than they? Dr. Newman's newly-started school at Birmingham professes to be intended for boys not designed for the ecclesiastical state; but some who had been educated there might of course turn out to have vocations, and I presume it would be no matter of regret to its illustrious founder if that should be the case. And after all, is the training required for boys who are to be Christian priests so very different from that of those who are simply to be Christian gentlemen? There must surely be very much in common between the general, as distinct from the special and directly professional, training of the two.

Closely connected with this question comes that of restrictions on reading, which are, I believe, usually imposed in Catholic colleges, and in some cases with a rigour which practically taboos all acquaintance with general literature during the period of school-life. I would not for a moment be supposed to underrate the immense importance of preserving purity. But is it preserved by this artificial system, even supposing it to be consistently carried out (which is scarcely possible), and not frustrated by any of the underhand contrivances which such a discipline is but too likely to engender? I should like to ascertain whether the same result could not be attained by other means, and whether the end is really secured which alone could compensate for the almost inevitable consequences of depressed imagination and stunted intellectual development, which must place the man trained on such a system at a grave disadvantage in his subsequent career, in his dealings with those differently educated, and especially in his dealings with Protestants. It is surely the *general* rule that precisely those whose intellect is least exercised, and whose imagination is most sluggish, are the readiest and most helpless slaves of the merely animal passions. Nor should it be forgotten that the more rigidly you narrow the limits of general information and thought, the more will the mental faculties be dwarfed, and the more exclusively will attention be concentrated, with a morbid and microscopic pertinacity, on petty criticisms of personal and domestic details. How far these consequences, or any of them, actually follow under our present system I am not now discussing; but certainly one does hear statements, on seemingly good authority, which would go far to show that the danger is not altogether a chimerical one.

No one would desire, especially at the present day, to lower the standard of theological acquirement among our clergy, but rather to raise it. The question is, whether that previous general education, the paramount importance of which has been so conclusively vindicated by Dr. Newman in his *University Lectures*, and which is admitted in all other cases to be the best foundation for a superstructure

of professional knowledge, be not *at least* equally important in the case of a science which has so close an interdependence on other branches of knowledge as theology, and in the case of men whose professional duties must necessarily bring them into contact with such various and divergent phases of human life and thought. To take but one instance, which may serve as a type of many others ; I mean the average standard of Catholic preaching in England. Why is it that, while the Protestant minister, ignorant for the most part of theology, fluctuating and uncertain in his views, and diffident of his authority as a teacher, can usually secure at least the respectful attention of an ordinary congregation to his stammering exposition of a mutilated creed, the Catholic priest, with his far more accurate theological knowledge, his well-ascertained principles of moral and dogmatic truth, and his unhesitating belief in that message from heaven which he, and he alone, is divinely commissioned to deliver, is but too often felt to be the utterer of pointless truisms, which fail to impress the intellect or to touch the heart ? Allowance must of course be made for the stress of work which weighs down many of our overtasked secular clergy ; but I can hardly think this is the *whole* explanation of a phenomenon precisely the reverse of what we should *a priori* have expected. Does not that intellectual refinement, that power of varied illustration, that mastery of language and thought, which are the result of an educated taste and fair acquaintance with the standard literatures, both prose and poetry, of our own and other countries, avail in the one case to light up the broken shadows of an unsatisfying religion with a glory not their own ; while, in the other, truths the most absorbing and sacred which tongue can utter, or heart of man conceive, fall dull and powerless on ears accustomed to that richness of poetic inspiration which has tuned the voices of the world, but seems wanting to the utterances of the sanctuary ? I shall be reminded, perhaps, of what is said about "the foolishness of preaching." Truly, if we had the zeal and sanctity of apostles, all subordinate gifts would be comparatively indifferent ; yet even St. Paul did not disdain to address the fastidious audience of Athens in a language which commanded their attention before it won their faith.

So much for the intellectual side of the question. But it has another aspect, and, to my mind, of far deeper importance, which I cannot wholly pass over, though it is impossible in the narrow limits of a letter to do more than briefly indicate its most salient points. I speak of that moulding of the affections and development of character which, as it is inconceivably the noblest, so is it also the most anxious and difficult portion of education, and on which far more than on mere intellectual training a man's future necessarily depends. Am I wrong in thinking that here too there are features in our existing system which suggest matter for grave reflection, if not for serious alarm ? There are, broadly speaking, and subject to various modifications on either side, two main principles on which the discipline of school life may be conducted, which for convenience I

will designate the principle of confidence and the principle of police. The latter is, I believe, the ordinary system of Continental colleges, whether Catholic or not. The former is, and has been growingly for many years, that usually recognised in England. There are, again, two ways of moulding character—by influence or by routine ; by guiding the affections, or by seeking to crush them. Let me say a word on each of these points.

We have most of us heard or read of Dr. Arnold's famous *dictum*, when he went to Rugby, "I shall always believe a boy's word, till he is proved to be a liar ;" and we also remember the result which his biographer has recorded—that it soon became a general feeling in the school, "it's a shame to tell Arnold a lie, because he always believes it." From an opposite principle an opposite result would have as surely followed. "Give a dog a bad name, and hang him," has passed into a proverb. Both it and its converse are equally and infallibly true. Is this principle recognised, or is it not rather too apt to be ignored in our English Catholic colleges ? It will perhaps be said that the material they have to manipulate is frequently such as to forbid confidence,—that the principle of honour is non-existent. For argument's sake, let us admit it ; then all the more reason for strenuously evoking a principle which lies at the root, not indeed of all sanctity, but of all which goes to make up the complex character of the gentleman ; and which, if it is most valuable in all cases, is certainly not least so for a priest. Of this I feel very sure, at least in dealing with Englishmen (and of them alone I am now speaking), that the measure of trust will always in the long run be the measure of trustworthiness. And of this too there can hardly be a doubt, that a system which simply produces a slavish and material obedience, without evoking any moral respect for the authority which commands, is not only not beneficial, but absolutely and fatally injurious to the character. The blind obedience of a Jesuit noviciate is a grand and sacred thing. But every one has not the vocation to be a Jesuit, and nobody can become one before a certain age. The blind obedience of a body of school-boys, whether ecclesiastical or not, enforced by a vigorous system of police inspection, will invariably end in the Spartan principle, that there is no disgrace in dishonesty, but much disgrace in being caught ; and that successful lying is a commendable ingenuity, where assertion is not accepted as an evidence of truth. Such a system, as I once heard remarked, may occasionally make a saint by accident ; but its natural tendency is to make sneaks by the score.

I have left myself but little room to speak of the guidance of the affections, a subject on which volumes might be written, but on which I will content myself here with but few words. It will scarcely be denied that they are as integral a part of our composite nature as the intellect or the will,—of our nature not simply as fallen and defiled, but as it came fresh and beautiful from its Creator's hand. And of this, as of all other radical facts of human nature, it is eminently true *neglectum sui ulciscitur*. F. Faber has remarked some-

where, if I remember rightly, that the affections are the natural basis on which all holiness is founded. At all events it is obvious that two things which have ever been marked characteristics of the saints, and are most essential qualifications for the priesthood, would naturally base themselves on the affections; I mean zeal for souls and sympathy for sinners. To say this is not to deny that both gifts are supernatural, or that they may, in special cases, be infused quite independently of natural disposition. But I am speaking of the ordinary laws of God's providence, and *gratia se accommodat naturæ* is a recognised principle of theology. Without at all disparaging the immense importance of intellectual gifts and acquirements for the work of the priesthood in this day and country, I do not hesitate to express my conviction that a warm heart is *more* important even than a vigorous mind. Of two priests, the one with a brilliant intellect and cold heart, the other of mediocre ability and strong sympathies, I feel little doubt that, *cæteris paribus*, the latter would do more work for God and souls than the former. If this be in any sense true, there is grave reason for mistrusting any system which tends to crush the affections as the price of preserving vocation. To treat all characters as identical, and stretch all varieties of moral and intellectual *ἡθός* on the same Procrustean bed, is doubtless a simpler and easier process than to mould and guide their all but infinite diversities by personal influence and discriminating sympathy. Only, while the highest result which the former system can contemplate is a statuesque model of frigid and unattractive excellence, the danger is great in all cases, and almost certain in many, of either ruining vocation or mutilating character probably for life. The obstructed river will break its banks, and the crushed energies of repressed affection will sooner or later find or form for themselves in some wild outbreak of passionate restlessness that vent which a cramping system had attempted to deny them. I cannot enter now on a proof of the oft-quoted proverb, *naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret*, which is also a first axiom both of philosophy and of common sense; but I would venture with all diffidence to ask one simple question. Is it or is it not desirable that precisely the noblest, the tenderest, the bravest natures, those which have the keenest sympathies, and therefore the widest possibilities of influence, whether for good or for evil, should on that very account be cashiered from the ranks of the priesthood, excluded from that one sphere where all their energies would find their highest expression in rallying the lost ones round the Redeemer's cross? For myself, in the name of common charity, of our common humanity, in the name of that Gospel which reckons among its most glorious triumphs the impetuous affection of the Prince of the Apostles, the self-sacrificing zeal mixed with most tender-hearted sympathy of the great Doctor of the Gentiles, and the ardent devotion of the "disciple whom Jesus loved," I do not hesitate to answer, No! Nor let it be said that to check the individual expression of the affections is to increase the capabilities of their range. All facts go to prove, what our knowledge of human nature would

have led us *a priori* to expect, that precisely the opposite is the case. The man who has no affections in particular will have little to show for the world at large. An abstract philanthropy is a very fine thing, but it always breaks down in practice. On the other hand, when individual sympathies are the keenest and the warmest, they are also the readiest to overflow on all who are brought within the range of their attraction. How immense, then, must be the importance of early training, when the character is yet unformed, when the affections are far more prominently developed than the intellect, when each kindly act or word may be rich in future harvests of priceless benediction, and each omission of a kindly act or word, how much more a harsh and unsympathetic coldness, may be fraught with mischief which after years will never be able to repair.

And now I have concluded, not indeed all that I could say on a well-nigh exhaustless subject, and one to which I am painfully conscious of having done most inadequate justice, but all that I have room to say here. Let me repeat what I said at the beginning, that I am seeking rather to ventilate the question than to lay down the law. My aim is not to complain of past defects, if such there be, which may be abundantly explained by the circumstances of the Church in this country, but to suggest inquiry for the future.

Your obedient servant,
X. Y. Z.

THE SIGNS OF MARTYRDOM IN THE CATACOMBS.

SIR,—Two redoubtable champions propose to meet in your pages, to debate the authenticity of certain relics taken from the Roman Catacombs; and your correspondent "J. P.," while bidding them speak out freely, hopes that no scandal may be given, or rather taken, by the expected encounter. I do not propose by this letter to interfere in any way between the parties in this controversy; but this mention of possible scandal suggests to me, that you may perhaps permit me to say a few words on what there is at stake, and how little we have to dread, with whomsoever victory should ultimately rest.

No doubt there would be, not only the fear, but the certainty of scandal, if any one whose initials are as recognisable as "J. S. N." were to tell us that a judgment had been reversed which we have been taught to regard as irreversible. No theory can survive a failure in practice, and a profession of infallibility must succumb before the *a-posteriori* argument of a reversal of judgment. The initials so generally recognised create for me a probable opinion of the fact of a judgment having been so reversed; and I hope that you may agree with me, that a few minutes may not be misspent in considering the character of the previous sentence now departed from. We think none the worse of the judgment of the Court of

Queen's Bench because we have seen cases in which that judgment has been revoked by the House of Lords on appeal. Is the decree of the Congregation of Rites (now, it is stated, recalled) of a similarly judicial and reversible nature, or does it partake of the supernatural infallibility of the definitions of the Apostolic See?

Few persons bear in mind that, even in matters of faith and morals, the Church is accustomed to issue decisive judgments in which she does not claim to exercise her full powers of infallibility. For instance, many think that before the definition of the Immaculate Conception, that doctrine was quite an open question, to be accepted or denied (at least privately) with impunity. But this is not true. To deny it then was not *heretical*, as it is now; but there are many ecclesiastical censures of propositions fatally condemnatory, yet short of heresy. If it was before 1854, as grave writers said, a *theological conclusion*, deduced, that is, from revelation, but by theologians, and not as yet by the Church herself, then was its contradiction *proximate to heresy*, to use the technical term. In this position exactly is the proposition that declares that deaconship is a sacrament. It cannot be denied without incurring this same note of *proximate to heresy*,—the strongest form of error short of heresy itself,—because theologians have found it in revelation, though the Church has not declared it to be there.

Of those condemnatory notes there are various degrees, into the examination of which I do not propose to enter, as I have sufficient to do in considering that which I have brought this to illustrate. It is plain that the presence of the element of human reason is that which removes an ecclesiastical definition more and more widely from the certainty of divine faith. Yet there are some human ingredients that either do not weaken or weaken but little the force of the sentence. Whenever it is necessary for the adequate performance of the work with which the Church has been intrusted, then, though a link in the chain be human, still its coherence and force is divine. The children of the Church would not practically be guarded from hurtful food, and fed on the bread of truth, if she were not infallible in dogmatic facts, and were not able to define, for example, that a certain book contains false doctrine. Hardly less needful for the faithful is the Church's preservation from error in the canonisation of saints; for else she might be proposing to her children as examples of virtue, and commanding them to invoke, those whose lives were not worthy of imitation, and who were powerless to aid them. Thus, though it is not an article of faith that the Church is infallible in her canonisations, no wonder that the voice of theologians pronounces her so to be.

But this relates to canonisation only. The same authority and the same arguments do not apply to beatification. The latter is permissive, and not preceptive; it applies to restricted localities only; and it is the equivalent in the modern discipline for those sentences which were passed in ancient times by particular Bishops or churches, and which received the tacit permission of the Roman

Pontiff. The ancient canonisation may have had a local origin ; but it only became equivalent to the modern solemnity when it was accepted by the Universal Church, and thus become obligatory with the consent of the Pope. This distinction between beatification and canonisation is expressly drawn by Pope Benedict XIV. : *Possibilitas erroris speculative non pugnat cum permissione, sicuti cum præcepto et præsertim quidem cum præcepto Ecclesiam universalem respiciente, ac minime sejuncto ab extremo supremi legislatoris iudicio.** In beatification there is, therefore, speaking speculatively, a possibility of error.

The absence of infallibility in beatification is in no way owing to the human elements involved in the proceedings, for these equally enter into canonisation ; but it is in consequence of the character of the sentence that it is not preceptive, that it does not affect the whole Church, that it is not the final and definitive judgment of the Vicar of Christ. Yet how great its solemnity is, those who have been present at any of the numerous beatifications that have happily taken place in this pontificate can testify.

A lesser degree of authority will attach to a less solemn judgment ; and that which ranks next to beatification is the approval of *cultus ab immemorabili*. This may be divided into two classes, to which we cannot attach precisely the same sanction ; those cases that have been approved by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and those that have the tacit consent of the Holy See. In the first of these two cases one thing only is done. The sole investigation to which the case is subjected is, whether the honour that is paid to the saint dates from before the year 1534, and has continued uninterruptedly ever since ; for this is the interpretation given by Urban VIII. of his decree forbidding all *cultus* that was not immemorial, that is, that was not of more than centenary standing when his decree was issued, in 1634. The life of the saint is not examined at all, nor is it needful to prove either his virtues or miracles. A somewhat recent instance of this is interesting to us Englishmen. In the thirteenth century, Boniface, of the royal family of Savoy, was Archbishop of Canterbury. The English chroniclers say no good thing of him ; so pertinaciously, indeed, that Father Waterworth, in his work on England and Rome, visits him with a similar condemnation. He died, however, at Haucatacombe, in his native land, on his way from Canterbury to Rome, and there he received the honours of the altar. At the prayer of Charles Albert, Pope Gregory XVI., by a decree dated September 7, 1838, approved of the immemorial veneration he has there received. He is therefore to be numbered amongst our Archbishops as the Blessed Boniface ; for he has received *equivalent beatification*. Far be it from me to intimate that I think that the chroniclers have told the truth concerning him ; on the contrary, there is good reason to believe that they have greatly calumniated him. But it is well worthy of remark, that the documents presented to the Congregation of Rites previous to this decree, which I

* Ben. XIV. De Canoniz. SS. cap. 64, § 9.

have had an opportunity of perusing, contain no allusion to such accusations. The sole question before the Sacred Congregation was, whether he had or had not received veneration as a saint during a certain number of years ; and the decree issued by Pope Gregory XVI. affirms that this was the case. But if a solemn beatification be no infallible sentence, though an examination into the virtues or martyrdom and of the miracles has taken place, sufficient to justify the Pope in proceeding at once to canonisation, if he should think fit, much less can infallibility be claimed for the far less formal judgment of *æquipollent beatification*, papal though it be.

Less still is the sanction bestowed on those cases of immemorial veneration which have the tacit permission of the Pope for their continuance. The case of Charlemagne is a very remarkable instance of this class. In the time of our St. Thomas of Canterbury, Guy of Cremona was Anti-pope under the name of Paschal III. At the desire of the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, who unites with his own name in his diploma* that of our King Henry II., who was then dallying with schism, the Anti-pope canonised Charlemagne. Up to this time mass had been said for him, as for others of the faithful departed ; but a *cultus* now began, not only at Aix, but generally in France, Belgium, and Germany, which has ever since prevailed ; and we remember, when passing through Aix-la-Chapelle, turning over the supplement to the missal there in use, and finding there the proper mass *B. Caroli Magni*. "Whatever we say about the concession made by an unlawful pontiff,"—these are the words of Pope Benedict XIV.,—"so many subsequent lawful pontiffs have known of the concession, and, by their tolerance of it, have admitted it, that if to this we add the observance of this very long lapse of time, there seems to be nothing wanting for the validity of the *cultus* for particular churches, and so for sufficient beatification."†

With *æquipollent beatification*,—to use a technical word in a technical sense,—must be ranked that spiritual patent of nobility, enrolment in the Roman Martyrology. Benedict XIV. speaks very explicitly of errors which have been already corrected, as well as of a few still needing correction—*et pauca quædam menda etiam corrigenda superesse* ; and for this he accounts by saying that it contains the names not only of canonised saints, but of others also who

* This diploma, confirming the privileges of the church of Aix-la-Chapelle, is dated Jan. 8, 1166. It is given by the Bollandists, Jan. 28, vol. ii. p. 888. It reads much more as if the canonisation had been performed by the emperor than by the Anti-pope : *Inde est quod nos gloriosis factis et meritis sanctissimi Imperatoris Caroli confidenter animati, et sedula petitione carissimi amici nostri Henrici Regis Angliæ inducti, assensu et auctoritate Domini Paschalis et ex consilio universorum Principum tum sæcularium quam Ecclesiasticorum, pro elevatione et exaltatione sanctissimi corporis ejus atque canonizatione, solemnem curiam in Natale Domini apud Aquisgranum celebravimus : ubi corpus ejus sanctissimum . . . cum magna frequentia Principum et copiosa multitudine cleri et populi, in hymnis et canticis spiritualibus cum timore et reverentia elevavimus et exaltavimus* IV. Kalendas Januarii,—that is, on the day on which, years after, the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury took place.

† De Canoniz. SS. i. cap. 9, § 3.

have only been subjected to these lesser processes—*sed inscripta quoque in eo reperiuntur aliorum nomina qui in album Sanctorum unquam a Summis Pontificibus relati sunt, sed tantum vel formaliter vel æquipollenter beatificati dici possunt sive per Romanos Pontifices, sive Episcoporum judicio juxta antiquam disciplinam.**

When the Calendar of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation was submitted to the Holy See, in 1784, when Monsignor Erskine, afterwards Cardinal, was Promotor of the Faith, five English saints whose names occurred in that Calendar were declared in the Decree of Propaganda (June 12, 1784) to be omitted in the Roman Martyrology. These are St. Wereburga, St. Oswald, St. Botolph, St. Etheldreda or Ediltrudis, and St. Benet (Biscop). Yet this statement is erroneous; for though I do not find the names of St. Wereburga or St. Botolph in the Martyrology, yet St. Etheldreda, whom the Benedictines wished to keep on the 17th of October, was already in the Martyrology† on the 23d of June, the day of her death, as *Sanctæ Ediltrudis Reginae et Virginis*, whom Erskine probably did not recognise. It is worth remarking, that an English Benedictine, who has recited at Matins the lessons from the Sarum Breviary, which were approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites on September 7, 1850, and in them the words *sexdecim post annos corpus ejus incorruptum repertum fuerit*, when he comes to sing her elogium from the Martyrology at Prime, says, *undecim post annis*. As, however, they come on different days, he probably does not notice the discrepancy. But both statements cannot be right. The old Martyrology of Maurolycus (Venice, 1576), calling her *Geltrudis*, says, *ab anno decimo*. Moreover, in the edition of the Martyrology by Rosweid, after Baronius (Antwerp, 1613), I find the names of St. Oswald, Aug. 5, and St. Benet (Biscop), Jan. 12.

In all these cases we have instances to which the saying of the same great Pontiff applies, that “in acts which are professions of divine faith, *speculative* truth in the material object is not always required, but *practical* is not unfrequently sufficient, arising from a prudent estimate of the matter.”‡

But facts of a more particular character, and depending for their proof more directly upon human evidence, may enter into, and in a large class of cases *must* enter into, and form the very foundation of the Church's judgment. Such judgments may be passed by the highest tribunal upon earth, the Holy Roman See, and yet be of their very nature reversible and in practice occasionally revoked.

St. Thomas of Aquin, in the *Quodlibet* (q. Art. 16), in which he maintains that the Church cannot err in the canonisation of saints, says, “As to sentences on particular facts, as on possessions, crimes,

* De Canoniz. SS. cap. 64, § 13.

† See Baronius's edition, which is of course considerably anterior to Erskine.

‡ “In actibus enim divinam fidem protestantibus non semper requiritur veritas *speculativa* ex parte objecti materialis, sed *practica* non raro satis est, ita ut videlicet de eo prudenter existimatur.” Ibid. § 12.

and such like, the judgment of the Church may err through false witnesses." For instance, it *might* happen that a man was excommunicated through false evidence, though truly innocent of the crime of which he was accused; and while bearing on earth the temporal consequences of the undeserved censure, he might be adding most largely to his store of merits. This is stated explicitly in the Canon Law itself: "We briefly answer your question thus, that the judgment of God ever rests upon the Truth which deceives not and is not deceived; but the judgment of the Church sometimes follows opinion, which often chances to deceive and to be deceived; hence it sometimes happens that he who is bound in God's sight is freed in that of the Church; and he who is free with God is bound by the sentence of the Church."*

So also in matrimonial causes. In the Congregation of the Council, which is a court from which no appeal lies, which is therefore the Holy See itself deciding, it is by no means uncommon to have the judgment on a case being reposed *recedendum a decisis*, or, *prævio recessu a decisis* so and so; almost as common, I was going to say, as the final affirmation of the original sentence, *in decisis et amplius*. On inquiry on the spot as to the reason of judgments being so often reversed on the rehearing, I was told that it arose from the fact that the parties who are in the right very often neglect to plead their case at the first hearing, trusting probably to their sense of right, and forgetful of the power of a skilful advocate to make the worse appear the better cause. Yet the first is an authoritative sentence of the Holy See, and its reversibility, its liability to error, in no way lessens the respect with which such judgment must be received till it is revoked. The *actual* validity of a marriage in no way depends upon this judgment. It was or was not a true marriage in the sight of God before the action was commenced; and the issue of the trial, whether on the right side or the wrong, cannot alter what was long before ratified in heaven. The Church can only judge by the evidence that is brought before her, and in such cases as these she may be deceived.

So also with respect to particular facts narrated in the lives of the Saints. The Roman Breviary has undergone revisions, in which, as a more critical spirit arose, or the sources of history became more accessible, narratives were altered or rejected which had been recited for a long series of years. This may be done again; but no one thinks with less respect of the Divine Office because it may contain statements respecting facts which are not in strict accordance with historical accuracy. For instance, it seems most probable that in the lessons for Ven. Bede, approved for our use by the Holy See, his age at the time of his death is misstated.

And now, sir, if you have borne with me thus far, perhaps you will let me ask why a sentence of the highest court on the sacrament of matrimony should be reversible, and a judgment affirming the authenticity of a certain relic or class of relics should not be capable

* Cap. *A nobis*, 28, de sent. excommunicat.

of reconsideration, and, if necessary, of revocation? There is a passage attributed to St. Augustine to this effect: *Multorum corpora venerantur in terris, quorum animæ cruciantur in inferis*. Like some other texts that have too traditional an existence, it is not to be found in the writings of the saint. But it induces an old theologian* to say things respecting relics which at least will give no scandal as coming from him.

"St. Augustine does not say (if the passage be genuine, which we deny) that we are wrong in venerating the bodies of those whom the Church has canonised, because their souls are suffering in hell; but that we venerate upon earth many bodies, which we think are the bodies of those whom the Church has declared to be saints, while in fact they are no such thing, but rather bodies of men who are lost and who are suffering in hell, infidels perhaps, assassins, pirates, or robbers, who have died with the worst of characters; but here it is not the judgment of the Church that deceives us, but we are subjected to these deceptions in the veneration of the saints from the vicissitudes through which the Christian republic has passed in the times of Moorish wars or Turkish tyranny. For the Church has decreed that St. Jerome is to be venerated and honoured; but she has nowhere defined by her judgment that this body, which we think to be St. Jerome's, is truly his body. So she has determined that St. John the Baptist is to be honoured with the greatest veneration; but from this it does not follow that it is certain by the Church's judgment that this head which we think is St. John's is his beyond a doubt; for perhaps it is some one else's. But if the Church were so to determine, having previously visited and diligently examined it, we must say that God would not permit the Pope to be deceived in this and to deceive us. And we constantly assert that, even though this doubt exists, veneration is to be shown to those relics which, either by the common opinion of Christians or by a great consent of prelates, are held to be those of saints. For though in this an error might happen, yet it is not to be presumed in a matter of such moment, and bearing so near a relation to religion."

The presumption is in favour of the relics being what they are professed to be, but in each case there is a possibility of error. If it were not so, how did St. Charles Borromeo come to have it said of him that he would not let men rest even when they were dead, such was his care in examining into the authenticity of relics, and such his zeal in rejecting those that would not satisfactorily bear his tests.

Pope Innocent III., in the Council of Lateran (cap. *Cum ex eo*), reserved to the Holy See the examination and approbation of all newly-discovered relics; but the Council of Trent (Sess. 25, *De venerat. Sanct. et Imag.*) conferred this power upon all Bishops: *Nulla admittenda esse nova miracula, nec novas reliquias recipiendas, nisi*

* Covarr. tom. 2, oper. variar. resolut. lib. i. cap. 10, no. 13, apud Ben. XIV. De Canoniz. SS. *loc. cit.*

recognoscente et approbante Episcopo, qui simul atque de iis aliquid compertum habuerit, adhibitis in consilium theologis, et aliis piis viris, ea faciat quæ veritati et pietati consentanea judicaverit. The Council does not even require the same formality as it orders in the promulgation of an indulgence, in which two canons of the cathedral have to take part. Such matters do not, therefore, require the judgment of the Church and the Pope; and when a Roman congregation gives a judgment, it simply means that the question cannot be reopened by any save itself, as the case in which a Bishop gave sentence might be. Who is to consider such decrees irreversible, if the Holy See itself does not do so? I do not think we need fear, though it has taken me many words to say why, lest, though "J. S. N." should show that the Sacred Congregation of Rites no longer regards as conclusive proof of martyrdom that which it once did so regard, any should be so foolish as to take scandal thereat.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
J. M.

Literary Notices.

A Visit to the Philippine Islands. By Sir John Bowring, LL.D., F.R.S. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1859.)—*Story of New Zealand, past and present, savage and civilised.* By A. S. Thomson, M.D. 2 vols. (London: Murray, 1859.) A comparison between the Philippine Islands and New Zealand would furnish a good test of the Spanish and Catholic as compared with the English and Protestant mode of treating the aborigines of colonised territories. Since the days of our buccaneers and Sir Walter Raleigh, it had been the custom to denounce the exterminating policy of the Spaniards, till Mr. Helps' delightful volumes taught a new lesson to those who would receive it. The proof is in the fact; the Indian has disappeared from our plantations; the Spanish colonies, to whatever state of anarchy and misery they have relapsed since their separation from Spain, are still peopled with men of the aboriginal blood. We have done, and the Spaniards have not done, what we blamed them for doing, and what we intended to teach them how to avoid doing by our superior example. In this we have been made fools of by the event; just as nature, with a bitter irony, has falsified the cry of the French revolutionists, "Primogeniture has but one child," and the infinite division of property has become the occasion of a real, and not only a metaphorical, sterility.

Sir John Bowring contrasts this aspect of Spanish and English colonisation. "The more enterprising invaders of Gothic or Anglo-Saxon blood have frequently exterminated the indigenous races of the remote countries in which they have settled. One wave of emigration has followed another; commerce and cultivation have

created a demand for, and provided a supply of, the intrusive visitors. But Spain has never furnished such numbers as to dislodge the aboriginal tribes. Her colonists have always been accompanied by large bodies of ecclesiastics, bent upon bringing 'the heathen' into the Christian fold. These missionaries have no doubt often stood between the cupidity of the conqueror and the weakness of the conquered. They have preserved, by protecting, the Indian clans ; and Sir John doubts whether their influence will not, on the whole, prove beneficial, though he recognises it as a law of nature "that the savage and least improvable races will continue to be supplanted or absorbed by those of a higher civilisation."

To the English mind it seems yet an unsolved problem whether a great material prosperity founded on a great crime should be at once aimed at ; or whether we should be content with the slow development of savage nature, treated with patience and tenderness, which is content to wait centuries for its harvest. We have our stringent laws against cruelty to brutes ; we hesitate whether or not to condemn the wholesale extirpation of whole clans and races of men.

The absence of this patience, not only in the lay, but in the missionary element of English colonisation is well exemplified in a case that has occurred in New Zealand. Most people have heard of the *tapu* or *taboo* of the Maori ; it was the religious sanction of the law ; it made certain things and persons sacred and inviolable ; such as the priests and chiefs, human flesh, dead bodies, persons engaged in planting, food, the sick, the first-fruits, and many other things. Many ceremonial inconveniences followed from the system, and in many of its parts it was superstitious ; but it was a real and powerful check on the conscience. But the missionaries have decreed that Christianity and *Tapu* cannot coexist, and the system is accordingly dying out, with marked injury to the morals and honesty of the natives.

But if the missionaries had been actuated with the spirit of the first apostles of Christianity, they would have done the exact contrary. The Latin *sanctus* was almost identical with the Maori *tapu*. By the Roman law, tribunes, ambassadors, and walls and gates of cities, were all *sancti* ; every thing connected with religion, all that was venerable and inviolable, was *sanctum*. No doubt there were tiresome ceremonies connected with this "superstition ;" but the first Christians did not destroy the good on account of the rust of error which it had contracted ; on the contrary, they adopted this notion of sanctity, purified it, extended it, and made it the foundation of morals and religion. The Maori *tapu* might have been treated in the same way, and would have been so treated if the missionaries had been like the Jesuits in China, who were so abused for the use they made of heathen customs, instead of ignorant and impatient Calvinists. On the other side, one of the Spanish friars in the Philippine Isles writes : "The tree must bear its fruit ; God in His wisdom has made many races of men, as He has made many

varieties of flowers ; and at last I reconciled myself to seeing the Indians do every thing differently from what we should do ; and keeping this in view, I could mould them like wax to my purpose."

This is the difference of the two systems. One is content to *grow*, the other is impatient to *do* ; one, therefore, is tolerant, the other intolerant ; or as the English would say, one is lazy, the other energetic. But the one improves the poor degraded savages that it takes in hand, leads them patiently by the hand for centuries of feebleness, till they forget their superstitions, and are ready to take their place in the world ; the other wants to pull up the savage at once to its own level, and breaks the feeble brains by requiring more than they can perform ; in its impatience it destroys the only foundation on which the superstructure of permanent improvement could be raised ; and then, when it has doubly degraded the already fallen savage, it pronounces him hopeless, and condemns him to pitiless extermination.

Of the two books which we have placed at the head of this notice, Sir John Bowring's is the most remarkable, as it treats of a subject new to English literature. Dr. Thomson's volumes appear to be a careful compilation by a person well acquainted with the islands.

Statistisches Jahrbuch der Kirche (*Annual of Ecclesiastical Statistics*). By P. Charles of St. Aloysius, Barefooted Carmelite of Wurzburg. (Ratisbon, 1860.) We wish to draw attention to this important undertaking, because it can only be made complete and accurate by being widely known, and by receiving contributions and corrections from different countries. The author published a book on the same subject fifteen years ago, and he has used, he tells us, every opportunity in the interval between the two publications to obtain the most correct details. This volume contains an account of the number of episcopal sees, of the secular clergy, and of the religious orders at the present time. The Catholic inhabitants of Europe are estimated at 146,000,000 ; America, 40,000,000 ; Asia, 5,000,000 ; Africa, 4,000,000 ; Australasia, 5,000,000 ; or 200,000,000 Catholics in all. This is probably about 10,000,000 too high, even if we allow the figure of speech by which France is said to contain a population of 33,000,000 Catholics. The whole number of episcopal sees in the Catholic Church is 891, of which 602 are in Europe, 140 in America, 96 in Asia, 30 in Africa, and 23 in Australasia. Of these bishops 108 are in the dominions of the Queen of England, more than belong at the present date to any other power ; whilst 236 are in Italy alone. Our author gives 286,000 as the whole number of secular priests throughout the Church, of whom 260,000 are in Europe. In this there is, however, an excess of nearly 19,000, as by an inexplicable blunder the number of Sicilian clergy, 7600, is estimated at 26,304. The statistics of the regular clergy are far more difficult to ascertain. Our author reckons 7065 religious houses of men, containing 96,636 individuals, 9247 convents, and more than 100,000 nuns. This is probably rather un-

derrated. The different congregations of reformed Franciscans form still, as they have always formed since the days of their glorious founder, the most numerous of all the orders. They have about 2000 houses and 25,000 religious, the Capuchins nearly half as many, and the Conventuals 4000. The Jesuits, who at the time of their suppression were 22,000, are now about 6000, increasing more rapidly perhaps than any other order. They have 226 houses. The Sisters of Charity are reckoned at 12,000 in 2000 houses. The whole number of religious orders of men is given at 83, that of the female orders at 94. It is not in things that can be represented by figures that the prosperity and promise of the Church can be discerned in our time. At the end of eighteen centuries of apostolate, she has still eight hundred millions of worshippers of false gods surrounding her, presenting an inexhaustible and almost inaccessible field for her missionary labours. Her growth has not been in expansion so much as in intensity. Her history has been a succession of external losses, which have given an impulse to successive victories over imperfect and rebellious elements within. First, Islamism, an outward foe, overran Asia and Africa, destroyed the Churches in two vast continents, and invaded the eastern and western extremities of southern Europe. Then the Eastern separated from the Western Church, and she who three centuries before had flourished throughout civilised Africa, and as far as central Asia, found herself restricted to the western half of Europe. That is the period in which religion most deeply penetrated the masses, and shone with the most intense lustre. It is the period of her utmost compression, from the eastern schism to the discovery of a new world, that we call by the mournful title of the Ages of Faith. They were the ages when zeal was warmest and when faith was purest. Then, when a new hemisphere was added to her domain, Protestantism arose, and carried away the north of Europe. And now the prophecy of an ancient writer is fulfilled; the age of suffering from tyrants is long gone by, the age of heresy is near its end, and the age of persecution by false brethren has arrived. A new danger, that of unbelief, saps the foundations of the Church, and must lead to a new apostasy. Protestantism was the seduction of the Teutonic race; unbelief is the temptation of the Roman. The Reformation and the wars of religion drove the centre and stronghold of religion to the southern countries, which were farthest from the danger, and for more than two centuries Catholicism bore a strong local colouring from the Italian, Spanish, and French character, a thing unknown to the Catholic middle ages. But now those who guarded the Church from the Teutonic Reformation have risen against her, and she finds in the lands beyond the Alps, the Rhine, and the sea, her most devoted children and her most able pastors. The revival of Gothic art is one of the most visible, but one of the least important symptoms of the mediæval renaissance which marks our age, as the revival of paganism marked the age of the Medici, and of that protest and reaction of the Teutonic mem-

bers of the Church which has been provoked by the rising of the Roman nations against her. A great work of internal regeneration appears to be, far more than distant conquests, her special and peculiar vocation in our day.

It seems as if the distant nations of the world needed to be brought within the range of European civilisation before the necessary conditions for their conversion can be obtained. Four thousand years elapsed between the fall and the redemption of man, during which the human race laboured to accomplish those ends which were preliminary to the coming of Christ. The chief instruments of the early expansion of the Church were the Hellenic world at the height of its intellectual cultivation, and the Teutonic race, when it had preserved above all barbarians the primitive virtues of humanity. Those were among the signs of the fullness of time for the nations that have ruled the world. But the mass of barbarians in this age have fallen far below the ancient Germans in ignorance, and the Greeks and Romans in corruption. Unless they are raised in the scale of humanity, they can hardly be fitted for Christianity. A natural process must take place in each country to prepare it for the truth, corresponding to that which led the civilisation of antiquity to desire and to look for a new revelation. Christ comes to each nation only when an angel has gone before Him to make straight His paths, and to awaken the expectation and aspirations which lead to faith. Thus it happened to the apostles that "when they had passed through Phrygia and Galatia, they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia; and when they were come into Mysia, they attempted to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not." But, on the other hand, "a vision was showed to Paul in the night, which was a man of Macedonia standing and beseeching him, and saying, Pass over into Macedonia and help us" (*Acts* xvi. 6, 7, 9).

Current Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

Parliamentary Reform.

May 3. The Reform Bill was read a second time, without a division, after a debate of six nights. The course of the discussion was from first to last unfavourable to the Bill, which was opposed by many of the supporters of the Government, as well as from the Opposition benches. Lord Palmerston, together with the majority of his colleagues, abstained from speaking. The speeches which excited the greatest interest and attention were those of Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer and Mr. Gregory—the former a great performance in a literary point of view, but destitute of the power of statesmanlike eloquence; the latter highly instructive, but hardly applicable to the question under discussion. Yet Mr. Gregory's speech exhibited, more clearly than any other, the temper of the House of Commons with regard to the Reform Bill. It was a striking and authentic account of political observations made on a tour in the United States—a warning against democracy founded on the example of America. None of the arguments told against the admission of a democratic element in the State, because they were derived exclusively from a country where democracy is supreme and unmixed with other balancing elements. It was not even fair as an attack on democracy; for it assumed that in America there are no disturbing causes to explain the unfavourable contrast which it offers to the older European democracies. Yet Mr. Gregory was heard with delight, and loudly applauded throughout, from every quarter of the House. An additional proof of the fear and dislike in which Mr. Bright is held was the constant series of attacks directed against him by a great number of Liberal speakers.

The most remarkable argument in favour of the principle of the Bill was delivered by Mr. Monckton Milnes; the best arguments against it, by Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Macaulay, who showed that some

constituencies are already swamped by the democratic element. Qualification, said Mr. Macaulay, is a local question, to be determined by the social distribution of each constituency. The franchise, to be adapted to the real condition of the nation, must be multiform. These objections were not answered by Mr. Gladstone, who effectually disposed of all the general arguments against the propriety of admitting the working-classes to the franchise, which had been urged especially by Mr. Black and Sir E. Bulwer. "Is it," he said, "altogether just to hold the language that has been held with respect to the inferior qualities of the working-man? Sir, I don't admit that the working-man, regarded as an individual, is less worthy of the suffrage than any other class." What we fear is not the bad qualities of the individual, but the numbers of the whole class. The claims of labour are as legitimate as the claims of property, and the working-classes may justly demand that their importance in the country should be represented in the State. The danger is from the mass, not the class, of working-men. In reply to this difficulty, Mr. Gladstone showed—and it is the most important argument used in favour of the Bill—in detail that the addition to the borough constituencies would be extremely moderate. "Are the working-classes to have the lion's share? What is the position of the working-classes in regard to the constituency of the country? You have already got a constituency of 410,000; you are going to add 150,000, or at the most extravagant estimate 200,000. That is 660,000. You have got a county constituency of 530,000. We expect to add about 150,000, making in all 686,000. Adding the Universities, the total constituency of England is 1,345,000. That number will be very largely diminished on account, of course, of plurality of votes. I cannot estimate the diminution; but I imagine it would diminish the total number by not less than one-sixth, and the gene-

ral result would be, that after popularising your representation in a country with a population of 20,000,000 and with 5,000,000 adult males, you would have a constituency of about 1,100,000, or 1,200,000. Surely a system which enfranchises one-fourth part of your adult males, and selects that one-fourth part, upon the whole, with great judgment and discretion, is not a very unreasonable system." The great majority of the House were pledged to reform. The Opposition could therefore only try to delay the progress of the Bill as much as possible, without declaring themselves decidedly against it. In a session in which there was so much important business of other kinds, the Fabian policy had a great chance of success. This was increased by a signal victory obtained by the Opposition before the time came when the Reform Bill was to be considered in Committee.

May 8. The third reading of the Bill for the Abolition of the Paper Duty was carried in the House of Commons by the narrow majority of 219 to 210.

May 21. It was thrown out, on the second reading, in the House of Lords, by a majority of 193 to 104. Inasmuch as it was proved that not a single precedent justified an alteration of taxation by the House of Lords, and as this great innovation was admitted on the ground of urgent necessity, it was a severe blow to the Government in its most popular element.

May 25. A committee was appointed by the House of Commons to search for precedents for the course taken by the peers. Meantime, however, the news from China, making it certain that great additional sums would be required for the war, supplied a practical justification of the rejection of a bill which would have caused a loss to the revenue this year of more than 800,000*l.* It reduced the matter to a question simply of constitutional privilege, and prevented the great excitement which might otherwise have arisen. It has been felt that the Lords have done no small service to the country, and the result has been so far greatly to enhance their authority, and to weaken the position of the ministry. In this unexpected manner, whilst

a Reform Bill was being carried through the House of Commons, the influence which it threatened to exercise on the balance of the constitution has led to a strong reaction, and a revival of the Conservative power in the country.

June 4. The Reform Bill was again brought forward previous to going into committee. A great number of instructions, intended to gain time, were found to be out of order. In the face of this policy of delay and procrastination, and considering that one of the chief objections to the Bill was the dislike of an early dissolution, Lord John Russell announced that the Scotch and Irish Reform Bills would not be brought forward this session. This step, which was designed to help the English Bill to pass into law this year, had the effect of leading the Opposition to abandon its Fabian tactics, and to try the chance of a division. It afforded the first plausible opportunity of attempting to throw out the Bill in an indirect way; for it was hoped that Scotch and Irish supporters of the measure would vote against the postponement of the Bills for Ireland and Scotland.

June 7. A Scotch member, Sir James Fergusson, moved the adjournment of the debate, on the ground that the English bill ought not to be proceeded with, if the Scotch and Irish bills are postponed. The three measures ought, he said, to be carried at once; and it would be better to bring them forward together next year, than to pass one now and leave the others for the next session. The three Bills were drawn up in harmony, and with reference to each other; and it would be highly inconvenient, in the uncertain state of affairs, to have a different representation for the three countries for an indefinite period, during which a dissolution would be impossible. Several Scotch and Irish supporters of Government voted, as was expected, for this motion. It was negatived by a majority of 269 to 248.

June 11. The Government, having asserted its power by a majority of 21, announced the withdrawal of the Bill in consideration of the advanced period of the session. The Opposition had succeeded in the policy of delay, though at the price of a de-

cided victory of ministers, by which they were enabled to sacrifice the Bill to the manifest advantage of the public service, without suffering any loss of influence in the House of Commons. The failure of the Reform Bill, like that of the Paper Bill, fell upon Mr. Bright and his friends; but they have the autumn months before them to agitate the two questions of Privilege and Reform. The prospects of the harvest and the state of the Continent, by which the success of their own French treaty is so much endangered, make it a matter of anxiety whether the reform of the representative system can be undertaken next year under such favourable auspices as those under which it has failed now; and whether the Conservative victory in 1860 will do aught but put off a settlement which none dare refuse to a time when it may be dangerous to concede it. "Tout obstacle," says De Maistre, "qui n'éteint pas une force en augmentant la puissance, parcequ'elle l'accumule."

The events of the session exhibit in the clearest light the character and errors of the two parties that compromise the influence, and promise to endanger the existence, of the State. We are threatened by ideal reformers and by absolute Conservatives, by Radicals and by Tories. Both parties are essentially unconstitutional; one by aiming at results which are not in the constitution, and are inconsistent with it; the other by denying a principle which is part of the constitution, and which is really the *nisus formativus* of its life. Each party is responsible for the existence of the other, in whose extravagance it finds its own justification. On the one hand, stability is invoked on behalf of the classes who possess power and wish to preserve it; on the other, a change is looked forward to which shall accommodate every thing to a new interest. It is mere political idolatry to imagine that the forms of a government are valuable in themselves; the right of prescription cannot apply to the representative part of the constitution. There is no ideal state to be realised, no golden age to be preserved. The wisdom of our ancestors binds us not to its products, but by its example. Together with their laws and institutions we have in-

herited from them the method by which they legislated and governed, and by which we have to improve and modify what they have left us. The greatest proof of their practical wisdom, and the greatest lesson for us is, that they provided so carefully for the wants which were actually felt, and for the circumstances in which they lived, that their laws cease to be suitable to an altered age. Laws and institutions as good for one age as for another, are good for none at all. Prescription has no authority in representation, and the merit of all government lies in representation.

It is only in the domain of nature that the idea is included in the reality, and that all which ought to be is. In the moral world the actual does not correspond with the ideal, and is therefore transient and provisional. It is our duty to endeavour to restore the harmony and correspondence by our own voluntary act. In nature, where the combination always necessarily exists and the idea is always realised, there is nothing but repetition; neither change nor progress. But in the moral world, the obligation of labouring continually to restore the identity of forms with their substance, is a source of perpetual activity and motion. The principle of ideal conservatism is a principle of progress, not of stagnation.

The nation is the substance of which the State is the outward form. Its political must correspond with its social existence and constitution, and be determined by it. It is impossible permanently to dissociate them. Revolutions are either attempts to do so by violent means, or reactions for the restoration of concord. The State is not a natural emanation of the nation, but a product of intelligent thought; and statesmanship is a process of free reflection by which the government is adapted to the people to whom it belongs. But while the particular State is a result of human design, society is more immediately subject to the Divine will. It is less under the control of man, and moves, under the guidance of Providence, by steps so slow and so imperceptible, that we cannot consciously influence their course, or even understand their direction. Now God guides the world by the power of

what are called natural laws, which men cannot alter or divert. It is by observing the uniform and regular action of these laws that the science of the philosophy of history attempts to justify His ways to man. The State is society personified. It possesses a more ethical, society a more physiological, character. In the State, as in the individual, the object of government is to promote the victory of the Divine will, to realise the designs of Providence. In this our own arbitrary speculation and policy must yield as far as possible to the objective results of the Divine action; that is, it must be restrained by reverence for law and for existing circumstances. Society is ever growing, independently of human design, and slowly but constantly modifying and developing its forms. This incessant growth supplies the progressive element in the State, which is moulded upon society and follows its variations. Political progress is a process of adaptation, not a result of speculation. This distinguishes reform from revolution. One is the change produced by the pressure of existing facts, the other by the influence of ideas without reference to facts. Government has thus to follow the example of nature in her operations, and to proceed regularly, organically; by evolution, not by change. Politics is a science of observation rather than of reasoning.

The growth of society demands an alteration of political institutions parallel with its own changes. But human works being devised and made once for all, we cannot bestow on them the power of growth or self-adaptation. We can do no more than make our institutions dependent on society, so that the need of modifying them may be easily felt, and that change may be possible as soon as needed. This elasticity is secured by attaching political forms to actual conditions and requirements of society, so that they may stand, not on their own merits or by their own strength, but by virtue of their harmony with it—not because they are absolutely good, but because they are actually suitable. Where this is understood, there is no dread of change; because, as it follows the social movement, it consists in regular and continuous development. As

growth is one of the laws of life, reform becomes one of the principles of government. An occasional crisis is inevitable, because no human sense can hear the footsteps of social progress, or watch the growth of man. We are aware of it at intervals, when we suddenly discover that the coat no longer fits. It is fortunate when these intervals are not too great, and remedies can be applied to local wants before they have time to kindle a universal discontent. That is the true conservatism which allows nothing to become antiquated or fall into decay.

A constitution may be perfectly symmetrical and ingenious, and yet it will be completely useless unless it coincides with the forms and exigencies of society. This is the only harmony required, and where it subsists the utmost external irregularity is no reproach to it. The energy with which the demand for amended representation is pressed on government depends on the nature of the forces which compose society. Whatever possesses social power necessarily claims political power. This is a law as supreme in politics as the law of gravitation in the material world. It is a consequence of this necessary union of the political with the social constitution, that representative government cannot be considered a particular form, but is the ideal of all political development, to which all other forms are subordinate, and to which in the progress of things they ultimately tend. It belongs essentially to the notion of the State; it is not a matter of choice. No nation can escape it when its time has come, although it may bring injury to many, and trouble to all. Its adoption is a test, not of the health or prosperity, but of the maturity of a nation. For this very reason, because it is the consummation and end of all political development, representative government is not adapted to all times and all places. Feudal aristocracy, absolute monarchy, and republicanism, are equally legitimate, though subordinate and transient, forms of the State. Only an organised society is capable of political representation.

The resources of the State multiply with the development of new social elements in the country, and in

proportion as it succeeds in adopting them, that is, in converting social into political forces. Wherever this is neglected or denied, the excluded element, though perhaps a great source of national prosperity, becomes a source of political weakness,—a foe instead of a friend. Wealth and knowledge are the chief instruments of power, and the chief claimants for political representation. It must therefore be commensurate with, and inseparable from, their extension and increase. As it is the business of civil society to extend the enjoyment of those advantages to ever wider and wider circles, so it is equally the business of the State to extend in the same measure the enjoyment of political rights. It is even the duty of government to accelerate this process, to hasten the necessity of extending the participation of political power, by promoting the increase of those resources which confer the franchise. The whole nation requires to be gradually refined, organised, and elevated into a political society. Where nothing is done to remove the narrow selfishness and inactivity of the lower orders, their existence will always be felt as a burden. Every society is naturally aristocratic, because all men do not possess an equal share of that which gives political power. But as far as moral and material well-being increases, as far as civilised life fulfils its ends, the aristocratic differences disappear, and the aristocratic character of the State fades away. The only means of preventing the circle of the governing classes from extending more and more widely is carefully to preserve ignorance and poverty. This is a policy commonly practised, and it is more reasonable and more consistent than the policy of those who are unwilling to admit the political consequences of the increase of wealth and the growth of education.

The following statistics exhibit in some degree the progress of those political elements in this country during the last generation : In 1818, when the population of England and Wales was 11,642,683, the number of day-scholars was 674,883 ; of Sunday-scholars, 477,225. In 1833, population, 14,386,415 ; day-scholars, 1,276,947 ; Sunday-scholars,

1,548,890. In 1851, population, 17,927,609 ; day-scholars, 2,144,378 ; Sunday-scholars, 2,407,642. The proportion of day-scholars to the population was therefore, in 1818, 1 in 17·25 ; in 1833, 1 in 11·27 ; in 1851, 1 in 8·36. Of Sunday-scholars the proportion was, in each of those years respectively, 1 in 24·40, 1 in 9·28, 1 in 7·45. The number of depositors in savings-banks was, in 1832, 427,473 ; and in 1856, 1,331,369. The deposits amounted in the former year to 13,435,969*l.* ; in 1859, to 38,968,312*l.*

If all individuals are represented, no class will be represented. The labouring class is a power in the land, and requires its importance to be recognised by the concession of political influence. But if its representation is determined, not by its power, but by its number,—if instead of being weighed it is counted,—no other class, right, or interest will be represented at all. If representation is made a question of arithmetic, government will become a question of arithmetic. The lower class ought to be represented through its best men possessing the franchise. The best men of a lower class are more fitted to exercise political power than the worst men of a higher class. Every class has a proletariat of its own. A skilled artisan is a more trustworthy member of the community than a low shopkeeper, and a wealthy tradesman than an insolvent nobleman. Generally speaking, nobody need fear revolution that does not fear reform, and the objection to reform by instalments proves a total misconception of the due harmony between society and the State, and between the interests of the several orders among themselves. On both sides, and in both extremes, an unworthy jealousy subsists, and men do not recognise the truth that each class prospers by the prosperity of the other. "The eye cannot say to the hand : I need not thy help ; nor again the head to the feet : I have no need of you. Yea much more those that seem to be the more feeble members of the body, are more necessary. . . . God hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honour. That there might be no schism in the body, but the members might be mutually careful one for another.

And if one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it; or, if one member glory, all the rest rejoice with it" (1 Cor. xii. 21-26).

This is what our extreme parties fail to understand; and we stand between one theory which threatens the State with petrification, and another which threatens it with dissolution. The agricultural interest has always had a Conservative, aristocratic character, and industry is as incurably democratic. The latter has gained during the last thirty years a succession of important victories. The prosperity of the State depends on the preservation of the balance between the two. The manufacturing interest had a fair claim to the readjustment which has taken place; but whereas the landed interest resisted that just claim altogether, and sought unfairly to maintain a political preponderance which the condition of society no longer justified, by the same law of the existence of social and political elements, that which has had its legitimate demands conceded to it aims at supremacy, and at the subjection of all other interests to its own. In these ulterior aims it is as unreasonable as the opposite party in the resistance it offered to the early claims of the manufacturers. It is important to distinguish in the democratic party its equitable demands from the exaggerations and usurpations which have sprung from the same original root.

The Manchester school does not profess, like the Americans, an abstract democratic theory, but founds a consistent system upon certain definite interests peculiar to our manufacturing population. This foundation forms its strength and its weakness; whilst it gives a reasonable and legitimate character to the original objects and wishes of the party, it leads to the application of that one criterion of interests to every question, and gives a material character to a whole system of policy. No system can be more complete or consistent in theory, or more logically reducible to one principle. None can be more universal in its practical application. The reason of its rapid progress and of its formidable power is not its theoretical truth, but the fact that it is the product and expression of the interests and opinions

of the most rapidly increasing section of the community. For during a period in which the agricultural population has increased seven per cent, the population of the manufacturing districts has increased thirty-seven per cent, and even the increase of the country population has been far more rapid than it was before the introduction of machinery. The growth of wealth has been still greater. The annual increase of the national wealth, which Porter estimated at 80,000,000*l.*, is almost exclusively due to the manufacturing class. In estimating the power of the class which produced the Manchester school, it would be as absurd to count merely its numbers as it would be to measure the influence of Paris by the proportion of its population to that of France. It possesses a power which is enormously intensified by concentration. The interest of this great class is clear, definite, and imperative; and in defending it, representatives of the school speak not in the name of a theory, but on behalf of the welfare of millions who depend for their existence on the prosperity of trade. The supreme consideration for them is to obtain the highest amount of employment. For this it is necessary that the cost of production should be as low, and the demand as high, as possible; that is, in order to multiply labour, it must be made as cheap, and the markets for its produce must be as numerous, as possible. By these two considerations, the Manchester party wishes the whole internal and external policy of the empire to be determined. By these they are guided in every question, and are obliged to become politicians in order to prosper as manufacturers. Now thirty years ago this great class of society was not represented in the legislature, and fifteen years ago it was still taxed for the benefit of another class. Reform and the abolition of the Corn-Laws first placed it on an equal footing, and enabled it to develop its interests into a system. In order to compete with foreign industry, it is necessary to be able to produce at less cost. Therefore the food of the workman, and the raw material of the manufacture, must both be cheapened to the utmost; and the reform of the tariff necessarily followed the aboli-

tion of the corn and navigation laws. This is the common notion of free trade, but the school understands the term in a far wider sense. Free trade is a principle which embraces all things, a formula that can be applied to every public question. It is nothing but the principle of free production, of removing every obstacle to cheapness. The condition of their existence is the foundation of their whole philosophy. They can never be at a loss to make their principle harmonise with their interest.

The perpetual competition which has so greatly developed our industry multiplies for the manufacturers the pressure of every financial burden. They are most persevering in their efforts to diminish the expenditure of the State, and the taxation which ensues from it; because, whereas others feel only the loss of the exact sum they pay to the exchequer, every burden on the manufacturers diminishes their powers of competition, and threatens them with the loss of their industrial supremacy. They advocate the voluntary system in religion on principles of free trade and free competition, and oppose establishments as a compulsory imposition on the people. The State exists for the purpose of removing the obstacles to the free development of trade and of the wealth of nations. Religion is beyond its sphere. Indirect taxation is tyrannical because it diminishes consumption; because it is a tax on labour, and raises its cost, which it is the sole function of the State to depress. The only just object of taxation is property, not labour: therefore direct taxation is alone legitimate. Indirect taxation impedes the creation of property; direct taxation promotes it: one is a source of poverty, the other of wealth.

This system of material interests possesses at the same time a species of moral dignity. The manufacturers are interested in the increase of production and consumption, not for their own sake only, but for millions who depend on them. Accordingly they have always been able to decorate their system with many high words; to represent free trade as a principle of social and political liberty, and their private interests as motives of philanthropy. Thus they have

succeeded in disguising the essentially material character of their philosophy. The most plausible of its consequences is the demand for perpetual universal peace. All men as consumers have certain common interests, and trade carries bonds of union to all mankind. "Such," says Lord Overstone, "is the beneficent law of international commercial intercourse; all trading countries have a common interest in the progressive prosperity of their neighbours; and no doubt can be entertained that the effects of a blow which an invasion of England would inflict upon our commercial prosperity must vibrate through the whole trading world." Competition, says Proudhon, implies a common aim. This extension of common interests over many nations is a great sign of the progress of the science of economy. Formerly it was believed, both in the economical and the political spheres, that what is gained by one is lost by another. *Quicquid alicubi adjicitur, says Bacon, alibi detrahitur.* The desire for the greatness of our country, says Voltaire, implies a desire for the destruction of our neighbour; it is evident that one country cannot profit unless another loses. But now the competition of trade is regarded no longer as a *bellum omnium contra omnes*. All legitimate interests, says Bastiat, are in harmony with each other. This is the merit of the Manchester doctrine, when they tell us that what remains for us to conquer is, not States with the sword, but markets with our industry. But, in fact, this is a mere question of pounds, shillings, and pence. Standing armies increase the weight of taxation, and fetter the arms of labour; and war interrupts consumption. Accordingly, at the beginning of the Russian war, we were reminded that every shot we fired might destroy a debtor or a customer of England. This is a new extreme, the exaggerated reaction of interest against passion; but also of material against moral motives. These errors are older than the Manchester school. They came in naturally in an age of sophisters, economists, and calculators. Thus Say considers all ecclesiastics as useless drones, and calls Napoleon a celebrated madman. Cooper, in his lectures on political economy (1826),

declared that a nation has no real existence, and is nothing but a technical term invented by statesmen, to serve, like logarithms, in certain calculations. The Manchester school are not the first who have seen nothing but the material element in politics, who think more of the goods produced than of the producer or consumer, of the work than of the workman. But they are the first who have carried out as a practical system of policy the preference of the interests of trade over those of any body or any other principle. National peculiarities, and even national jealousies which defend them, are necessary conditions for the progress of mankind; and quarrels may always proceed from the inevitable differences of interest, feeling, or opinion. "Nothing," says a great historian, "contributed more to the Macedonian and the Roman conquests than the cosmopolitism of the later Greek philosophers."

In reality, the practical result of the principle that the interests of labour are the supreme law, leads to the rejection of every moral influence in politics. The Ten-Hours Bill was opposed as a sort of moral protectionism. The State has no right to interfere in the free contract between the artisan and his employer. Its business is only to prevent all interference and to remove every influence. In protecting moral against material interests, men against goods, the State is powerless. But where it has to act in favour of the producing interest, then it is omnipotent, because the claims of that interest are paramount and imperative. So that freedom is not their object, but their pretext. Their real object justifies the action of the most unmitigated despotism. It is in direct contradiction with their professions. They favour civil liberty only as a means to an end; and they prefer a despotism, if, by the sacrifice of all other rights, those of industry can be secured. Hence the Emperor of the French, who, in

his efforts to strengthen the material foundations of a power which is absolutely destitute of any moral support, has done more for the encouragement of trade and the repression of thought than any foreign prince, is so completely the ideal of the party, that they not only praise him for his economical policy, but affirm, as Mr. Cobden has done, that the French enjoy in full measure the blessings of real freedom.

The purpose of the reform advocated by the Manchester party is not the improvement of the representation, but its destruction. For representation serves to combine all particular interests in the paramount interest and policy of the State. But our Radical reformers desire the absolute predominance of one interest, the subservience of the State to it. This is the policy of which an absolute monarch can be the guardian and instrument as well as an assembly, and with which a real representative body cannot coexist.

None have more to gain than Catholics from the partial success of this school in carrying out yet farther its views. None have so much to lose by its complete triumph. The specious theories which are used with such success against our adversaries will be turned with more fatal consequences against ourselves; and we shall find that we are assailed, not only in the outer material interests of the Church, but by the systematic destruction of every moral sentiment, of every higher motive, of every god-like trace in the soul of man. We shall find ourselves compelled to make the bitter choice between temporal rights and spiritual advantage, between this world and the next; and we shall find that we are the fiercest and the most powerful antagonists of a party which has at one period been our greatest benefactor, but with whom we have never had one single positive principle in common.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

The Revolution in Italy.

The Revolution has taken one further step in its advance towards the unity of Italy. In our last number we had to relate the annexation of Central Italy to Piedmont by the vote of the people. In proceeding to take possession of his new dominions, Victor Emmanuel was received at Florence by demonstrations of enthusiasm, among which the exhibition of the veiled standards of Naples, Rome, and Venetia, indicated that a part only of the work was done, and announced to the remaining Italian powers that they would soon find themselves attacked. The attack accordingly commenced at the weakest point.

In the month of March an insurrection broke out in Sicily, commencing in Palermo. Its immediate leaders were among the discontented nobles who were in opposition to the government since 1848. There can be no doubt that for internal reasons alone an insurrection was to be expected, whenever the state of Italian affairs gave a fair prospect of success. That prospect was now given by the weakness of Austria, and by the promise of aid from Piedmont, if not from France.

In 1829, on April 16th, the most famous royalist of the Restoration, Chateaubriand, then ambassador at Rome, spoke as follows of the government of Naples in a despatch to the Minister of Foreign Affairs: "It is too true that the government of the Two Sicilies has fallen to the last degree of contempt. . . . They take for conspiracies what is only the general discomfort, the product of the age, the conflict of the old society with the new, of the old and decrepid institutions with the energy of the younger generation. . . . A frontier custom-house can no longer separate liberty from bondage. A man cannot be hanged on one side of a brook for principles which on the other side are deemed sacred." In the following year the late King Ferdinand succeeded, and was admonished by Louis Philippe of the necessity of a constitution. "Freedom," he replied, "is fatal to the House of Bourbon, and for my part I am re-

solved to avoid at any price the fate of Louis XVI. and Charles X. My people obeys force, and submits.

. . . . With God's help, I will give it prosperity, and the just administration to which it has a right. . . . My people has no need to think; I shall take care of its well-being and of its dignity." He reigned accordingly by the protection of material interests. There were 1506 miles of roads in his dominions at his accession; he added 4500 miles. His labours for the improvement of harbours, for reclaiming land, &c., were most extensive. The example of the Emperor Nicholas was always before him. But in proscribing thought, and considering only material existence as essential to a people, while the moral sphere is full of danger to the State and to religion, he estranged from himself all who aimed higher either for good or for ill. The people generally were sufficiently degraded to be content with such a system. Those who live by their daily labour are seldom moved by any considerations but those which regard their means of subsistence. These being amply provided for, they had not leisure to attend to other things. There is hardly any middle class. The oppressive character of the system was therefore felt chiefly by the educated classes—the nobility and the Church. The former were the principal enemies of the government; the latter, its principal victim. There is no more perfect test of the character of a government than its position towards the Church. A Protestant State may exclude her, or persecute her on religious grounds; but the modifications of her relation to a Catholic state depend entirely upon political considerations. Politically it is no reproach to a Catholic country that it refuses to give perfect equality to a Protestant minority, or to a Protestant country that it denies equal rights to a minority of Catholics. Civil disabilities on religious grounds are not only consistent with the true notion of government, but essential to it, provided they are founded on a very great inequality of numbers. In Spain, for instance, and in Sweden, certain restrictions have been founded

on reasons both of religious feeling and of political expediency. It would be absurd to deny that, where religious unity subsists, its maintenance is a matter both of religious duty and of public advantage. Religious liberty is not a principle of politics, but a political remedy for the evils with which religious differences menace the State. The exclusion of a religion is, however, a very different matter from its repression. We cannot put on the same level the Swedish laws against Catholics with the proceedings of the Swiss Protestants at the time of the Sonderbund, or the severities of the Inquisition with those by which the Emperor Nicholas effected a great apostasy in Lithuania. In a country wholly Catholic or wholly Protestant religious intolerance is not necessarily incompatible with civil liberty. Where different religions subsist together in one State, religious intolerance implies political tyranny. But when in a purely Catholic country the Church is deprived of her independence, it is the surest and strongest sign that can be given of a false theory of government. For the only system which is absolutely contrary to the freedom of the Church, and necessarily at war with her, is the system of arbitrary power. The freedom of the Church in Catholic States can only be asserted in conjunction with other liberties, and is obnoxious only to a policy which endangers in like manner every species of political independence. For this reason it is much better for Catholics to suffer injustice from a Protestant than from a Catholic government; for in the one they may be free at least in other respects, in the other they suffer from a whole system of oppression. Besides, the sufferings endured from heretics or infidels have not the corrupting influence which is exercised by the jealous protection of Catholic sovereigns. This poisonous effect of Catholic despotism has nowhere been more fatal to religion than at Naples, and there is no revolution conceivable in Europe by which religion is less likely to be ultimately a sufferer than a revolution directed against the Neapolitan crown. The Church has less to fear from the revolution than from the despotism that preceded it. This is not, however, an

argument which can be allowed to weigh in determining the lawfulness and justice of the revolution itself. It is on totally different grounds that the events that have occurred must be judged. But we desired to show that there is no occasion to allow any sympathy for the government to interfere with the question of right and wrong.

A gulf far wider than the Straits of Messina separates the Two Sicilies. Their history is quite distinct. The Island of Sicily belonged, from the peace of Utrecht till 1734, to the House of Savoy. When the French occupied Naples, it never fell into their hands, and being under British protection, became for a time almost a dependency of Great Britain. After the war of 1809, it was expected that Murat would invade the island, and the court looked to England for defence. During this period King Ferdinand violated the ancient Sicilian constitution by arbitrarily imposing new taxes; and when the Estates protested, five of the leading barons were arrested and thrown into prison. In consequence of this dispute, the English government directed their minister at Palermo, Lord William Bentinck, to effect a military occupation of the country. A reform of the old constitution was resolved on, and the king abdicated provisionally in favour of his son. Bentinck reorganised the Sicilian army, and in the course of nine months 7000 Sicilian troops were detached to join our armies in Spain. At the same time the mediæval constitution of the country was reformed in imitation of England. The old king disliked and resisted these changes. He resumed his authority, and when, at the Restoration, he recovered his dominions on the continent, he published a manifesto of the most liberal description (1st May 1815): "A firm, wise, and religious government is secured to you. The people will be sovereign (*il popolo sarà sovrano*), and the prince will be the depositary of the laws, and will frame the most energetic and the most desirable of constitutions." Nevertheless the parliament of Sicily was ignored, the new institutions were rejected as unsuited to the nation, and the old as unsuited to the times. At Naples the king

found all things arranged by the French upon the principles of modern absolutism, which possessed such a fatal attraction for the restored princes throughout Europe. He resolved to assimilate the two portions of his kingdom, and to govern Sicily by the same convenient system of uniformity and centralisation which he found prepared for him at Naples.

June 21, 1821. Lord William Bentinck, supported by Sir James Mackintosh, brought these events before the consideration of the House of Commons. So far, he said, from the stipulations of the English ministers having been fulfilled, after the evacuation of Sicily by the English army, there never was a more complete annihilation of all rights and privileges than that which followed. . . . Great merit was attached to the king for having agreed to the abolition of the feudal system. His view, in reality, was to get rid of the only check that existed against the unlimited power of the Crown. It was, however, urged by Lord Castlereagh, in reply, that there never was a constitution less suited to the genius of a people, or less likely to work beneficially for them, than that which had been formed in imitation of the English; and it was generally felt, when the English troops left the island, that the constitution could not stand. This was hardly an exaggeration; but it was no defence of the policy of the Neapolitan government in abolishing the new constitution without restoring the old.

When the Carbonari were in power at Naples, in 1820, the Sicilians likewise rose up in arms, and demanded the restoration of their national rights. But the Italian liberals, then as now, were more intent upon increasing the central power in the State, whilst it was in their hands, than on promoting local independence. They sent troops to quell the insurrection, and to preserve the legislative and administrative union. Palermo capitulated, on condition that the question of the union should be submitted to a Sicilian parliament; but the Neapolitan parliament refused to ratify the capitulation. This shows the vast difference which has hitherto subsisted between the Sicilian movement and the Italian revolution.

The old Sicilian constitution had grown up gradually, like that of England, from the Norman conquest. It had maintained itself, with its aristocratic character unaltered, through all the troubles and revolutions of the Continent. Even under the dominion of Spain it continued to be respected; and whilst other European dependencies of the Spanish crown suffered an intolerable oppression, in Sicily the conquerors and the natives lived in harmony together. The French revolution itself left no traces there, and the revolutionary changes were only introduced at the restoration on behalf of the royal power. So that, whilst the Italians were incited by the revolutionary ideas to attack the legitimate thrones, the Sicilians were protesting against the revolutionary policy of the legitimate government, and appealing to their ancient laws, which had been respected by many dynasties of kings. The Sicilian revolution of 1848 was the protest of a nation, headed by its natural leaders, in favour of its laws; it was the act of the clergy and of the aristocracy, not of a party. For this reason it was less violent and less energetic than the movement in the rest of Italy. It did not invoke the passions of the people. It was more spontaneous and less prepared—a popular rising, not a conspiracy—a protest against definite grievances, not a pursuit of speculative ends. It broke out quite independently of the movement on the mainland, and preceded it by many weeks. It followed the reforms of Pius IX., not the revolution of February; and its rallying cry was, "Long live Pius IX. and the Constitution." The chiefs of the Italian revolution vehemently denounced a movement so different in its origin and its ends from their own. Garibaldi was solicited by the Sicilians to command them, and he refused. Their insurrection had none of the characteristics of the Italian; they did not desire the unity of Italy, and they had no republican sympathies. When the deposition of the House of Bourbon was voted, the immediate question was, whether the crown should be offered to a prince of the House of Lorraine or of the House of Savoy. In Sicily, as in Naples, there is no middle class, and

the common people took little interest in what was done. They were generally excluded from the elections by the law, which restricted the franchise to those who could read and write; and it was difficult therefore to raise an army. The attempt which failed twelve years ago has now been renewed, this time with complete success. The higher classes and the clergy have taken part as before, the people have fought with fury, and foreign aid has decided the victory.

A government so degrading as that of Naples would have explained an insurrection in any civilised community, but it would not have served as a legal justification of it. The government of Sicily was manifestly unjust and revolutionary, as well as oppressive. Suffering and discontent do not give a people the right to revolt, because prosperity and happiness are not things which it has an absolute right to claim of its rulers, or which a government is necessarily able to provide. The State is an institution by which public and private rights are to be maintained, and wrong punished. Two theories have been popular in modern times which denied that duty—the theory of absolute monarchy, and the theory of the sovereignty of the people. According to both, the sovereign, whether the monarch or the people, can do no wrong. In both systems, therefore, passive obedience is a duty. Both are to a certain degree idolatrous, and altogether revolutionary, for they set up might in place of right, and substitute a new system of ordinances, a new fountain of authority in the place of the commandments of God. Both deny the existence of a higher law, and elevate the public authority over the individual conscience. It is hard for the Christian notion of government to maintain itself between these impious systems. It teaches that all authority is sacred, inasmuch as it comes from God. The absolutists say that the royal authority is alone divine; the democrats, that only the collective authority of the people is divine. But a State is not simply the antithesis of sovereignty and subjection. It is a complex system of authorities and services. Now we hold that all power, not all sovereignty only, is from God. The paternal authority, the eccle-

siastical authority, every natural local authority, all equally enjoy the divine sanction. Each is in its sphere supreme, and each is a limit to the sovereign power. An assault upon any such authority is criminal and revolutionary, whether it proceed from its subjects, or from another authority. The power of the State is supreme only in its own sphere, like that of the family, the municipality, the Church, the parliament. All these powers are protected by the State, none can be controlled by it. It is their right and their duty to restrain its action within its own definite limits. It is out of these several partial authorities that the State has grown. Where they subsist, law and right can prevail, because there are organs to maintain it. When they disappear before a levelling absolutism, a revolutionary condition ensues, in which might alone prevails, and in which might alone can be appealed to. A nation so governed is not really a State, and the laws of political rights and duties do not apply to it. It is a system of arbitrary power, restrained by violence—a system in which laws are silent.

If, therefore, the sovereign power is bound by the same law as every other authority, it is subject to the same responsibility. But the sovereign in defending his rights commands the power of the State. The other authorities possess only the forces of society. One is organised, the other is not. Therefore the defence of legitimate rights, when not undertaken by the supreme power, bears necessarily a violent character. An established order must be overthrown when it is resisted on behalf of an established right. Self-government is the end of all government, and implies the right of self-defence. The theory of passive obedience is as entirely revolutionary as the theory of the sovereignty of the people, whilst the Christian theory admits the divine right of princes, and not of princes only, but of every other organised authority, down to that of the husband and the father. That this view of the character of the State is inconsistent with absolute government, is nowhere so well understood as by the absolutists themselves. They have, therefore, endeavoured to

break down all those kindred and coeval powers whose rights are independent of the State. As, however, an abstract authority is powerless without the instrumentality of concrete authorities, the system of absolutism has replaced the local powers by agents deriving their authority from the State. Bureaucratic centralisation took the place of self-government, and the State instead of an organism became a machine. Countries in which this unnatural system has prevailed are exposed to continual revolutions. It is inconsistent with freedom, and therefore with the natural political development. In a country like Sicily, the question is whether a wrong has been committed. If it has, the right is with those who seek to redress the wrong.

It became evident by the end of April that the Sicilians could not drive the Neapolitans from the island if unassisted by a foreign force, or by a diversion in Naples itself. Of the latter there was no probability. The disbanded regiments of Swiss had been immediately replaced by a foreign legion, the whole army was on a war footing, and the kingdom was separated from revolutionary Italy by a barrier which promised effectual resistance.

Lamoricière had taken the command of the diminished army of Rome, and Monsignor de Mérode, who had served under his orders in Africa, was minister of war. The great visible defender of the temporal power of the Holy See could no longer be relied on. The dominion of the Austrians in Milan and Florence, on which the sovereignty of the four last Popes ostensibly depended, was broken, and the Romagna was already lost. Then the question arose, whether, in the absence of the power with whose cause that of the Papacy appeared to be identified, the voluntary efforts of the Catholics generally could not effectually replace it; whether in reality it was true that the Pope's temporal crown must stand or fall with the hegemony of Austria in Italy. A cry of enthusiasm rang through the Catholic world. It found its first and loudest echo among those who were friends of the Pope without being friends of the Austrians. The Catholics of France were foremost in

their protest, and in the writings of Dupanloup, Lacordaire, Sauzet, Montalembert, the feeling conspicuously displays itself, that the cause of the Papacy must be separated from that of foreign domination; that national independence is as sacred and as just as personal liberty; that the Pope may be a temporal sovereign even in a united Italy. The sympathy so warmly shown by the French found better and more active instruments elsewhere. A general collection was made for the Pope, and it included many a splendid offering and many a widow's mite. Offerings more generous and more valuable than presents of gold soon followed. Thousands of volunteers poured in from Austria and Ireland, faster than they could be armed and organised. Before the end of May, Lamoricière was at the head of 18,000 well-disciplined troops, concentrated near the frontier, between Rome and Ancona, and able to defy any movement proceeding from the free corps alone. The prestige of a great commander in southern Italy threatened the plans of Sardinia with discomfiture. Their execution was hastened. Early in May, it was announced that Garibaldi was preparing an expedition to Sicily. The Neapolitan government applied to England to prevent it. Lord John Russell wrote to Turin to protest against the expedition being permitted to depart, and to Naples to protest against the policy of the king; and he announced to the House of Commons, that the latter protest, by which he dealt a heavy blow to the position of the Neapolitan government, was justified and counterbalanced by the great service he had rendered by preventing the departure of Garibaldi.

May 7. Garibaldi embarked at night with about 1200 men in the neighbourhood of Genoa, on board two vessels. The garrison of Genoa was confined to barracks, in order to prevent the soldiers enlisting in large numbers in the expedition. Having thus fulfilled their engagement with England, and facilitated on land the preparations of departure, the Piedmontese government sent out a ship of war to intercept Garibaldi. At the same time they explained to the Powers that he was too popular and influential a person in the coun-

try for an administration so enfeebled as that of Count Cavour by the disaffection in Tuscany, and by the cession of Nice and Savoy, to take energetic steps to stop his undertaking. It is evident that the conduct that they pursued was dictated by distinct motives of policy. If while Lamoricière consolidated the pontifical throne the Neapolitans should succeed in quelling the Sicilian insurrection, a reaction would necessarily commence from the South, which would convert into open rebellion the doubtful allegiance of the Tuscans, whilst the government at home was shaken by the violent opposition of the advanced patriotic party. The march of events loudly called for a diversion in Sicily.

May 11. Garibaldi landed at Marsala, without loss, in the presence of Neapolitan and English men-of-war. The former might have prevented the landing, but were disconcerted by the presence of the British. After two successful actions, the insurgents, aided by Garibaldi, appeared on the eleventh day after the landing on the heights before Palermo. The garrison consisted of 20,000 men; but the city was now no longer quiet. A large body of troops could not be sent out without great danger. For Palermo has near 200,000 inhabitants, and was restrained only by martial law, proclaimed 16th May. Two regiments refused to fire, and were sent to Naples. Even the police began to desert. After the fighting began, some ships with Swiss soldiers arrived in the harbour, and the soldiers were not landed. Meantime Garibaldi received new reinforcements from Genoa and Leghorn, and Sardinian ships were busy at night landing stores and ammunition along the coast.

May 27. Garibaldi forced his way into Palermo. The whole city rose in arms at his appearance. The royal troops retired into the forts and bombarded the place. An armistice was concluded, and the Neapolitan general offered to capitulate. The king appealed to the great Powers in vain that the integrity of his dominions might be guaranteed. England refused to mediate, but used her influence to prevent Sardinia from fomenting disturbances on the mainland. The king then ratified the ca-

pitulation of the garrison of Palermo, and on the 9th June the evacuation commenced. A force of near 9000 men still holds Messina.

Garibaldi proceeded to take possession of Sicily in the name of Victor Emmanuel, and to organise a provisional government. It is extremely doubtful whether the Sicilians will bear the Piedmontese government beyond the moment when it is necessary to enable them to expel the Neapolitans from Messina. So far the clergy has taken no part against Garibaldi. Now, as in 1848, they are for separation. But at this very moment the open conflict has begun between the government of Turin and the clergy of the annexed provinces. The Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa, the Bishops of Imola and Faenza, the vicar occupying at Bologna the place of the famous Cardinal Viale, who died on the 15th of May, the chapter of Piacenza, and other dignitaries have been arrested, because they acted in obedience to the decree of excommunication. That at the same time a good understanding should subsist between Garibaldi, whose watchword was "Death to the priests," and the Sicilian clergy, proves how terribly political excitement outstrips the religious feeling of the Italians, and how much the hatred of the Church depends upon her political position.

France has taken no prominent part in these events. The French troops have been busy evacuating Lombardy and occupying Savoy. Meantime the government claims the sanction of a European conference for the annexation, and sends forth semi-official pamphlets to prepare the way for an attack on Prussia and an attack on England, as it formerly announced the war with Austria and with the Pope. They are all dictated by the same policy, and are parts of the same design, which sent Garibaldi to Sicily, and promises to lead the combined forces of France and of a united Italy against the German powers and their allies.

June 15. The Emperor Napoleon arrived at Baden to meet the Prince Regent of Prussia, the four German kings, and many of the reigning princes. He was badly received by the people in Germany, and elicited from the assembled princes a demonstration of unity which was not be-

lieved to exist, and from the Regent the announcement of an understanding with Austria which was not expected.

Spain.

The last few months form an important epoch in the history of constitutional Spain. A popular foreign war has been carried to a successful termination, a Carlist insurrection has been subdued without difficulty or effort, and the Carlist princes have renounced their pretensions to the crown. Whilst the throne of Queen Isabella seems thus secured for the future, the kingdom has entered upon a new period of prosperity and development, of which we take this opportunity of giving some instances.

The fall of Tetuan did not decide the fate of the Morocco war, for it induced the Spanish commander to raise his demands, and thus led the war party in Morocco to insist on a prolonged resistance. The regular army had not been engaged, and the duty of resisting the Spaniards had fallen, for the most part, on the inhabitants of the province through which they passed. In order to satisfy this party, a renewal of the conflict was required, and Muley Abbas resolved to give battle once more for the defence of Tangier, before accepting the Spanish conditions of peace. March 23d, O'Donnell set out from Tetuan on his road to Tangier, and was attacked the same day by the Moors. As in every action of the war, the victory remained with the Spaniards, though with a loss of 1700 men. Next day the Moors determined to treat.

Whilst the Spanish army was engaged in Africa, the governor of the Balearic Islands, General Ortega, landed with his troops in Spain, and proclaimed Don Carlos. He was deserted by his men, taken prisoner, and shot with several others. The Carlists had long conspired to take advantage of the difficult situation of O'Donnell to attempt a new rising. Ortega had been to Paris to prepare it, and Count Montemolin arrived there from Naples, intending to put himself at the head of the movement. His wish was to wait for O'Donnell's return, when it was expected that the conditions of peace would make him unpopular. It was clear that if the war was deemed successful, and

he could reap the fruits of his success, the Carlists lost their chance for good, for Queen Isabella's throne had not yet been strengthened by the glory of a military success abroad. Ortega induced his chief to consent to his wish to make the attempt in the absence of O'Donnell with the army in Africa. This resolution was suddenly adopted after the Carlist leaders, Cabrera and Elio, had returned to London, with the understanding that the affair would be postponed. Their friends in Spain were not prepared for this sudden change of plan, and so nothing was ready, and the power of O'Donnell was consolidated. April 21st, Count Montemolin (Don Carlos) and his brother Don Fernando were arrested near Tortosa.

May 2. An act of renunciation of his claims to the crown of Spain was signed by Count Montemolin, in his prison. It contained, however, no express recognition of the rights of the Queen. The Spanish pretender had been kept in strict confinement, without any communication with his friends. He consented to sign the document, which was drawn up for him, in order to save the lives of Elio and others of his party who were taken. But it was stipulated that the act should be valid only when it had been ratified by him after his liberation, and after he had quitted Spain. He was, however, no sooner at liberty than the Carlists protested against his resignation, denied his right to give it, and denied also the authenticity of the act. The second brother of Count Montemolin, Don Juan de Borbon, had opposed the design of Ortega, but when he heard that it was resolved on, left England to take part in it. Before he had reached Spain, however, Ortega was taken, and he returned home. Here he published a manifesto to the Cortes, protesting against the act by which his brother Don Carlos had abandoned the rights of his family, and declaring that he meant to uphold them, although he hoped for his restoration only by peaceful means, and the return of the Spanish people to the principle of legitimacy, not by arms or bloodshed.

A general amnesty was proclaimed in Spain, to all who would consent to swear allegiance to the Queen. It

was intended as a proof to the world how little the Carlist party was feared, and how complete its discomfiture was believed to be. In confirmation of this view, the Queen's speech to the Cortes, 25th May, contained no allusion to the abdication of Don Carlos, and the Cortes determined not to consider the letter of Don Juan. But O'Donnell firmly refused to abrogate the decree by which the younger branch of the royal family are banished from Spain, and declared that it would be followed by great danger to the throne and the dynasty.

The claims of the Carlist party were founded on the most exaggerated view of legitimacy, which treats public as a part of private law, and makes the national law of the Spaniards and their practice for centuries subservient to the habits of the foreign dynasty who reigned over them. No principle of right is involved in their cause, and it is hard to feel any personal sympathy for their pretenders. But the Christino party has exhibited all the evil qualities of modern liberalism, and is distinctly opposed to the old Spanish character, and to all that is valuable in the institutions of old Spain. For some years after the defeat of Cabrera, in 1839, there seemed little prospect of a permanent settlement, and the country was distracted by the animosities of Moderados and Progressistas as much as it had been by the antagonism of Christinos and Carlists. The peace brought no remedy for the calamities of war. It will be enough if we quote the opinion which was held by the greatest Spaniard of our time on his country about ten years ago: "The most corrupting and the most corrupt person in our society is the middle class, whose representatives we are. Do you not see that it has all its cries and applause for those who have the power in their hands? . . . Idolatry seems to be the natural religion of all multitudes, especially of those that have been corrupted by revolutions. . . . Not only are the sentiments corrupt, but the ideas also are perverted; and I think I may affirm that at no period of our history has the level of intellect been lower amongst us. . . . Our country is lost, utterly lost, irrecoverably lost. The moderate party,

that has preserved order till now, seems to me definitely exhausted and carried away in the general movement of dissolution. . . . Spain has arrived at the period of the last years of Louis Philippe, and is on the eve of the catastrophe of February" (*Donoso Cortes, Works*, i. 416, 420; ii. 140, 162).

About the same time a celebrated French economist, Blanqui, travelled in Spain, and wrote as follows: "The barracks have taken the place of the monasteries, the soldier has supplanted the monk, but nobody has thought of the labourer and producer. Those who formerly lived on the alms of the religious bodies now live upon the salaries of the State. There is no more aristocracy, and no more clergy, and there is not yet a third estate." In 1850 the pension-list amounted to 136,000,000 reals, in 1854 to 162,000,000. Every civil office has several nominal occupants, creatures of successive ministries, of Narvaez, Espartero, or O'Donnell, who receive half-pay. In like manner each division has several generals, every regiment four or five colonels. O'Donnell himself appointed in the course of a few months fifty-eight brigadiers, 142 majors, and 238 captains, to strengthen his party.

In the twenty-five years of the constitutional life of Spain, there have been 47 presidents of the council of ministers, and 529 ministers. This parliamentary anarchy appears now to be at an end, and the present is the first powerful administration that has subsisted of late. Its strength is in the energy and good fortune of its chief, and in the exhaustion of the old parties. The termination of the long dispute with Rome promises a happier period for the Spanish Church; and in all material departments extraordinary progress has been lately made. "It is my conviction," wrote Blanqui in 1850, "that Spain has a future before her, if not more brilliant, at least more solid, than the past of which she is so proud. People think her an exhausted and worn-out country, whereas she is only badly governed."

In the year 1846 the population of Spain was hardly 12,000,000; it now exceeds 16,000,000. In 1855 the annual mortality was 1 in 33; it is now 1 in 38. In 1768 the number of the

clergy was 210,000; it is now 44,000. All the religious orders of men have disappeared. The whole property of the clergy, which has been confiscated by the State, amounted to 24,000,000%. By the convention of 25th August 1859, the Church has, however, the right of acquiring property without any limitation, and independently of the annual payment guaranteed to the clergy from the State. Of the whole territory of Spain, fourteen per cent is not at present under cultivation. Even now the produce of agriculture is almost double the consumption, and the quantity of wine annually exported is nearly half the whole produce. The agricultural exports in 1858 amounted to 10,000,000%. In 1850 the whole imports were 671,993,640 reals, and the exports 488,690,949. In 1857 the former had increased to 1,555,375,013 reals, the latter to 1,168,584,599. The number of Spanish vessels entering the ports in 1850 were 2567; in 1857, 4719: leaving them in 1850, 2198; in 1857, 4483. Foreign vessels entered in 1850, 1911; in 1857, 4944: left in 1850, 2072; in 1857, 3292. The tonnage of the former was, in 1850, 303,742 tons; in 1857, 429,659. Of the latter, in 1850, 270,232; in 1857, 790,333. The number of schools has increased since 1855 by 3500. There are still not enough for half the number of children requiring education.

It is clear that after a long probation the Church is fast recovering a most salutary influence upon the people, such as she did not possess in the time of her greatest prosperity and wealth. For the influence she will now enjoy will belong to herself alone, and will be founded on nothing but the religious faith of the people. Formerly it was derived in part from her property, in part from the help of the State, and was exercised in great part for the service of the State. "God," says Donoso Cortes, "has made nations curable; but it is not intrigues, but principles, that have the divine virtue of healing them."

Emancipation of the Serfs in Russia.

It is difficult to compress within the limits of our monthly chronicle any intelligible notice of the efforts of the Russian government to accom-

plish a revolution more vast than those to which the attention of western Europe is confined, or than that question of abolition upon which the political interests of America depend. Its progress can be understood only by grouping together the facts and events of a considerable period; for the movement is slow and silent, and if we wait for the crisis itself we may wait in vain.

All nations have passed through the stage of slavery on their way to civilisation, and the process now going on in Russia has occurred, under many varieties of circumstances, every where else. For liberty is a plant of slow growth and late maturity, and belongs only to nations that have reached their prime and have not approached decay. An institution so universal and apparently inevitable cannot be treated as simply an evil or a wrong, and it is as vain to rail against it absolutely as to complain that children cannot take care of themselves. Helplessness or childishness is contemptible only in a grown-up man, and slavery is criminal only when it is artificial. At one period of society it is natural and beneficial. It marks in the history of civilisation the first step out of savage life. Savages of the lowest stage, who have neither fixed nor movable property, neither house nor land, hunters, like the North American Indians, give no quarter in battle, or spare their prisoners only to torture them. An Indian cannot keep his captive, for he cannot make him useful in his mode of life. The moment a prisoner is armed, like his master, he is virtually free. If weapons are denied him, the master himself must toil to support him. These savages have neither wealth nor humanity enough to adopt the institution of slavery, and in the absence of that resource their women are degraded practically to the condition of slaves; whilst, therefore, at one period of civilised life slavery is the most unnatural and oppressive evil, at another period it is a blessing and an improvement.

It arises as soon as a people begins to have fixed settlements and to till the soil. Land is then the only kind of property; those who have none depend for their existence on those that have. The only equivalent they

can give is their labour; and in order that their children may be fed, their bondage becomes hereditary. The bondsman cultivates the soil; the owner is able to attend to higher concerns, his wife and children enjoy equality and freedom, and a great step onwards has been taken in the growth of civilisation. Slavery is the beginning of the division of labour, and the first shape in which it appears. Nor is it in those early stages felt as oppressive; for abuse is rare, as the master has hardly any protection against the revenge of his slaves; and it is only when we have the consciousness of freedom that we can perceive that we do not possess it. Discontent begins later on, when servitude ceases to be natural; and then severity on one side makes up for willingness on the other. Then theories of liberty and religion begin to be invoked, and people argue like the abolitionists in America, that slavery is wrong, and unchristian in principle. In the Church this was not thought of until the ninth century, when a new theory began to be formed, to suit an altered state of things. As wants increase, as labour becomes more remunerative and the population more dense, slavery becomes less advantageous. Slave-labour is naturally unproductive, and totally unfit for the higher kinds of industry. Haxthausen says, that serfs are seldom employed in the factories of their own masters. They are sent out to find work for themselves, paying a tax (*obrok*) to their landlord, who finds the paid labour of the serfs of other masters more profitable than the cheaper labour of his own. The introduction of beasts of burden raised the slave one step; capital and machinery made him useless altogether. If the shuttle, says Aristotle, could weave, and the lyre play, of itself, then neither would the architect want servants nor the master slaves (*Politics*, i. 4). Tucker calculates, that the point at which the interest of the owner leads to emancipation depends on the density of the population. Where there are sixty-six inhabitants per square mile, he considers that slavery ceases to be a good speculation. In England, the abolition of serfdom began when the population was about forty per square mile, and was concluded when it was

ninety-two. In Russia, it is only twenty-five; but from the enormous spaces that are not inhabited, it is very unequal. In this lies one great difficulty of emancipation. The same measure has to be applied simultaneously to districts differing widely in their economical condition and interests, and at various stages of political development. In no other European country has serfdom possessed a character so oppressive as in Russia, yet it has almost everywhere required violent political convulsions to prepare its abolition. In France, emancipation was the work of the revolution of 1789; in Prussia, of the catastrophe of 1806; in Austria, of the revolution of 1848. Where there has not been an energetic and persistent pressure, it has generally failed. In Russia, this pressure has been supplied chiefly by the Crimean war. Russian serfdom is the last remnant of servitude in Christian Europe, and it is the most recent in its origin.

Like all nomad tribes, the Slavonians at their first settlement in Europe were personally free. The larger proprietors endeavoured, in the natural course of things when agriculture begins, to render those of less property dependent on themselves. It has been said that the first reaction against this tendency of the wealthier class was the adoption of Christianity, and *Krestiane* is still the appellation of the country people in distinction from the inhabitants of towns. Under the innumerable petty princes of the dynasty of Rurik, the village community was the proprietor of the land, and the individual members were free. They paid collectively tribute to the nobles, who had no claim upon the individuals severally, and who were precluded from any excess of authority by the right which the people enjoyed of free emigration. This latter right was the great drawback on the power of the nobility, and made the people quite independent of them, whilst it in no way affected the interests of the sovereign, as it did not extend beyond his dominions. The right was very commonly put in practice, as it was the means by which the people prevented the growth of the authority of the landlords. The unity of power, which the Czars obtained in the wars for national independence, was based

on the attachment of the free peasantry, who saw in the sovereign their protector against the nobles and against the Tartars. The monarchical power developed itself both against the foreign invaders and against the aristocracy. The interests of the common people were carefully respected. The last Czars of the house of Rurik, especially Ivan the Terrible, were the most sanguinary tyrants that history records. But their violence and cruelty were directed against the aristocracy, who limited and divided their power, never against the people, who were its instruments; and Ivan lives in popular tradition like our own bluff King Hal, as a jolly good-natured prince, a comic, not an awful figure. And in his time the lot of the Russian peasant was not oppressive. But when the last of the descendants of Rurik died, an aristocratic reaction ensued, and the boyars raised one of themselves to the throne. The first act of the triumphant aristocracy was to abolish that right of migration which was the great barrier to their power, and the great security of the freedom of the people. On St. George's Day, 1602, every peasant was attached inseparably to the spot which he inhabited at the moment. They became *glebe adscripti*, the mildest form of bondage, and in the existing state of society a necessary condition to give value to the land by securing its cultivation. This reaction of the Russian boyars is not unexampled in other places. In Bohemia, serfdom had completely disappeared by the fourteenth century, when the preponderance of the nobles under Ladislas II. led to its restoration. In Hungary, it began to be abolished early in the twelfth century, but in the year 1351 the right of migration was taken away.

The law of Boris made the peasantry entirely dependent on the landlord, without any resource against oppression. Yet their personal liberty was nominally acknowledged, and the village continued to enjoy the property of its own lands. They formed a system of tributary communities, seldom molested by the nobles. Their constitution is the great peculiarity of Russian life, and explains the patience with which the people have borne a grievous tyr-

anny. The notion of personal rights and freedom develops itself even with the progress of civilisation. In the lower stages the individual is very little considered; he acts only in a collective capacity; the State deals with groups and corporations. For as the State performs very few of the services required for the existence of society, society is then obliged to provide its own organs for the purpose, in its orders, communities, corporations, and other natural associations. The supreme power is designed to do little more than to preserve the nation from external danger, consequently the sovereign is usually only the most powerful member of the community, as the most suited to perform that function; otherwise he has little authority, and does not interfere in internal concerns. It is hard to say whether the local communities are parts of the State, or whether the State is an alliance of separate communities. But as it has little power, and little to perform, the corporations which supply its place naturally possess great authority over individuals. This is the character of mediæval society. It is a consequence of this that the body which performs such important functions makes corresponding claims. The chief of these is the ownership of the land. The immediate owner has only the enjoyment of it, the *dominium utile*. At his death his estate lapses to the community. When a nomad tribe adopts fixed settlements, each individual has equal claims with the others, and as the flocks were common property, the land is held in common, and each man receives his allotment. The Anglo-Saxons called this system Folkland, and it survived to the present century in the North of England, under the name of partnership tenure. It may subsist until the sense of personal rights and duties—which all the Slavonic races imperfectly possess—is developed by cultivation, wealth, and the division of labour, and whilst there is a superfluity of uncultivated land. In both respects Russia still remains at this stage of progress; and the system appears so naturally suited to the country, independently of all internal reasons for preferring it, that even the German colonists in

Saratow wished to organise themselves in this way. In this institution many Russian patriots place their hopes of the political regeneration of the country. It contains an element of local self-government, for its affairs are administered by a chief elected by a council of elders, who control his action and share his authority, and have even the power of deposing him. But in this system the idea of personal liberty does not exist, and cannot even be admitted without destroying the whole fabric of communism. It has encouraged tyranny rather than checked it by making it easier to bear, and by destroying the self-dependence of the people who are accustomed to rely upon the community for every thing; and it has been the lever by which the crown has broken the only power which could restrain its own, that of the nobility. It is the means by which the nobles have found it possible to make serfs of the peasants, and by which they have themselves been made dependent.

The system of communism is in fact as injurious economically as it is politically, and whilst it subsists the financial purpose of the emancipation cannot be attained. It injures agriculture as much as servitude can do; for whilst the land of the nobles is badly cultivated, because the labour of a serf is less valuable than that of paid free labourers, the village lands are badly tilled because no man feels a personal interest in the improvement of his allotted portion, with which no hopes and no memories are connected, which does not represent to him the accumulation of the labour of his fathers, and which will not secure the results of his own toil to his descendants. Personal freedom is impossible without personal property. Servitude was required in order to attach the peasant to the soil, because his social communism detached him from it. If the first is removed, he will have no inducement to remain in his own village, to which the feeling of home fails to bind him. The nomad propensity which was the bane of old Russia will be revived, and the land, in which the undeveloped resources of the empire chiefly lie, will be less productive than before.

When the peasant was bound ir-

revocably to the glebe, he had no means of escaping from the tyranny of the nobles, and no means of restraining it. On this foundation, therefore, a superstructure of unmitigated servitude was arbitrarily raised. The nobles used their obligation of levying troops and money for the crown to reduce the peasants to personal bondage, and gradually to assume the right of disposing of the common land. Of this irregular and abnormal state of things Peter the Great took advantage to make them entirely responsible for the people, whilst he deprived them of their political privileges. The territorial aristocracy was transformed into an official hierarchy, but they obtained unlimited power over the peasants, and at the same time, the whole responsibility of their existence. The ukase of 1723 bound the serf to the person of his owner in addition to his bondage to the soil. But it now was in the power of the landlord to release him from his local immobility. The serf might be sent away to push his fortune and to shift for himself, on condition of paying a tax to his owner, who was no longer answerable for him. This tribute was called *obrok*. It seemed a profitable arrangement to both parties, but it served to demoralise still further the whole system, to create a Russian proletariat, and to impoverish the village communities. For it happened often that all the able-bodied men were sent off in this way, to get money for their masters, and none but women, children, and old men remained at home. At first, therefore, bondage had been introduced by the nobles for their own advantage. But with the growth of the despotic monarchy, and with the increase of its exactions and of its pressure upon themselves, they became more and more exacting in the treatment of their serfs, and shifted upon them the burdens which the Czar imposed upon themselves. The servitude of the peasant is only a consequence of the despotism of the State. The time has now come when the interests of the same despotism demand its abolition. All that was done for the relief of the peasantry under Nicholas aimed at the total destruction of the social influence of the aristocracy.

European Russia, with a territory

eleven times as large as that of France, has less than double the population of France; and the public revenue is less than one-third of the French. The reason of this national poverty, in spite of the great fertility of part of the country, lies chiefly in the institution of serfdom. The serf is a bad and indolent workman. Count Bernstoff converted the serfs on his estates in Poland into tenant farmers, at an expense of 15,000*l*. His income rose in 24 years from 450*l*. to 4000*l*. The rate of reproduction of wheat increased from 3 for 1 to 8½ for 1. The produce of an estate cultivated by serfs is less than the cost of the labour if it was paid for at the price it would otherwise fetch. That is to say, that comparing the value of the labouring power and the value of the produce, the land is cultivated at a loss to the nation. But whilst the State was thus interested in the abolition of serfdom, a change became necessary for the safety of the nobles. Their unpopularity has become so great, that many do not dare to live on their estates, and on an average 73 proprietors are annually murdered by their serfs. Both the government and the aristocracy were therefore agreed as to the necessity of emancipation, though not as to the mode.

"A row of gentlemen along the streets
Suspended may illuminate mankind,
As also bonfires made of country-seats."

By the Crimean war, that which had been a matter of policy became a matter of necessity. For two years trade and commerce were interrupted, the factories had ceased to work, and the land was imperfectly tilled. The alteration in the whole life of the people was so great and so universal, that it was impossible to think of returning to the old state of things. It became evident, that after the peace a new era would begin, and society would have to find a new footing. In all but the north-eastern governments the whole population had been called to arms by the month of October 1855. All who took the cross became exempt from the civil law. The landlords lost their jurisdiction, and could find nobody to employ, whilst the families of their peasants were left upon their hands. The limits fixed for the age at which men were bound to serve

were exceeded, so as to include many of those who had not reached and of those who had passed it. In the one year 1855, 738,955 men joined the army. Even the Jews, who were exempt from conscription when they joined the Russian church, a *manœuvre* which the government had found highly successful, lost that privilege.

The loss was far greater in proportion than the force supplied. This has always been the case in the Russian armies, from the extent and climate of the country, and from the low organisation and defective treatment which are a consequence of the state of society. The recruits are originally serfs; and the common soldier is so little thought of, that it was a usual punishment to condemn criminals to military service. Add to this the corruption of the official world, and the prodigious losses can be explained. In 1812, the armies opposed to Napoleon amounted to 210,000 men; between June and December they had lost 169,519. Of a reinforcement of 10,000 men, sent to Wilna, only 1,700 reached the scene of action. Only 15,000 men pursued the main French army across the frontier. In 1828 and 1829, 115,000 Russians invaded Turkey, of whom only 15,000 returned. In the course of 1854, the Russian loss was 111,132. In four months 40,000 died at Simpheropol, and 100,000 lay in the hospitals of the neighbourhood.

Not a man remained for peaceful pursuits; all the resources of the empire were absorbed in the war. A civilised nation could not have borne this mode of defence, and even Russia could not bear it without a great change in its condition. The blockade of the Baltic ports was felt more deeply than the victories of the Allies. The importation of raw material, on which all the industry of Russia depends, and which cannot bear the expense of land transport, entirely ceased. The price of many commodities rose 500 per cent. The taxes have produced 3,000,000*l*. a year less since the war; whilst 300,000,000 roubles have been added to the debt. All this pressed most heavily on the nobles, and the continuation of the war would have led to their complete ruin. The government waited until the nobility

acknowledged the necessity of peace; for then it shifted from its own shoulders the unpopularity of admitting the defeat, and the impossibility of carrying on the war, and at the same time knew that it could take advantage of the distress and weakness of the nobles to accomplish the reforms of which they had been the stronger opponents. Immediately after the peace of Paris, Alexander II. addressed the following words to the nobility of Moscow: "The greatest success in war does not make up for the evils that accompany it. It has interrupted the trade of the empire with most of the European nations. Undoubtedly I should have continued the contest had not the voice of neighbouring nations condemned the policy of the last years. . . . Even if fortune had been always as faithful to our arms as it continued to be in Asia, the empire would have exhausted its resources by keeping up great armies in several quarters, especially as the soldiers were taken away from the fields and the factories. Even in the government of Moscow the factories were shut up. I prefer the real prosperity of the arts of peace to the empty glory of battles." The difficulties began when the army returned. The men expected to receive their freedom in return for their military service. They carried into their homes the habit of bearing arms, the feeling of their claims and of their power. Again the burden fell upon the nobles, who had to provide for the disbanded troops. The aristocracy became more and more helpless and dependent on the crown. It became evident that some great measure must be taken to restore order in society, which the war had disorganised, and to satisfy the aspirations it had awakened. The official classes suffered as much morally from the war as the nobles suffered materially. The corruption was brought to light in an astounding degree. The sums which were discovered after a strict inquiry to have been stolen in the administration of the army during the war exceeded 16,000,000*l.* All this favoured the claims of the serfs. What helped them most was the financial difficulty. The empire required the creation of new sources of wealth. Accordingly

the first act after the war was the decree announcing a vast system of railways; the next was the commencement of a series of measures for the development of the industrial resources of the lower classes, for serfdom cramps production. These measures are always described as being designed for the improvement of the peasant population—they tend naturally to emancipation. But it is a fact which has never been concealed or disguised by the Russian press, that the object which all these measures of economical development and social improvement are destined to attain, is the supremacy of Russia in Europe.

The emancipation was inaugurated by a rescript, dated 2d December 1857, in which the Emperor empowered the nobles of Lithuania to consult about the means of improving the condition of the labouring classes. At the same time the wish was expressed, that the nobles of other governments would take counsel for the same end. This was responded to by addresses from the majority of the governments. The manner of their inquiry, and the principles which were to guide them, were then determined. The landlord is to retain the ownership of his whole estate, the peasant having the right to purchase the freehold of his house and garden. The peasant, moreover, is to have the use of as much land as he requires to satisfy the demands of the State and of his landlord, and for the maintenance of his family. In return for this he must pay the landlord either in money or in labour. This is the principle which the nobility of different governments were to adapt to local exigencies. The first objection to it was, that as the right of migration would be restored, the peasant could not be forced either to cultivate the land or to pay for his own portion either in money or labour. In order to provide against the notorious restlessness of the Russian peasant, it was resolved that the purchase of house and homestead should be compulsory, "in order," said the minister, "to prevent a pernicious restlessness and vagrancy in the country population." It must be paid for, in money or in labour, within fifteen years. At present, however, the peasant regards his

house as his property, his only property indeed. It is a poor inducement, therefore, for him to remain there, that he is to work hard for years, in order to secure a legal possession, which has, as it is, never been disputed. This law greatly increases his burdens, without any corresponding advantage. The purchase of farm-land is optional; but the purchase of the farm-buildings being compulsory, the choice is scarcely free. So that the uncertain prospect of future freedom is offered to the impatient and excited serf at the price of oppressive labour, which is to be immediately exacted of him. Whilst the nobles were threatened with a heavy loss, the peasants had as little as possible to hope for. The resistance to this proposal came chiefly from the lesser nobles, who, possessing only a few serfs, who worked for themselves and paid them a certain tribute, were threatened with ruin. Now there are 45,000 proprietors of less than 20 serfs. Accordingly many refused to attend the meetings to which they were summoned, and little progress was made. A new rescript, of February 1858, attempted to encourage and promote the work and to reassure the nobles. A period of twelve years was fixed for the practical result of their deliberations, and a central committee was appointed at Petersburg. The committees of the several governments began now to work in earnest, and by the beginning of this year they had, for the most part, sent in their report. None object to the government proposal, but all are alarmed at the consequences of emancipation without compensation to the nobility. The universal feeling of the magnitude of the revolution which is in progress manifests itself in the claims which the nobles advance, and in their general bearing. When Alexander I. expressed his wish for the emancipation of the serfs, he was reminded of the manner of his father's death, and said no more. Under Alexander II. the emancipation has become so urgently necessary for the existence of the State, that the opposition is powerless. But it is not less general; for all the conditions under which it can be safely carried out are wanting, and the government has done nothing to prepare the way.

As soon as it began to be spoken of, the price of land fell fifty per cent. The committee of nobles at Petersburg declared that if the bondage of the peasantry is a usurpation of the nobility, the absolutism of the Czar is not less a usurpation, and just as recent. They demanded, therefore, as an equivalent for the rights they were about to lose, a wholesale restoration of the state of things which subsisted before Peter the Great, and especially the revival of the *Duma*, the parliament of the old Russian aristocracy. The deputies of the several governments assembled at Petersburg in the course of the autumn refused to accept the proposals of General Rostoffzoff, the head of the central committee, and applied to the Emperor for permission to return to their homes. At the end of last year one of the leading deputies, Besobrasoff, published a separate protest against any settlement of the question which should not proceed from an assembly of notables. He was instantly banished from the capital. The most memorable and instructive document of all is the report of the nobles of the important government of Tver: "We acknowledge that the Emperor's design must be realised. But we require compensation such as the State concedes at every expropriation for the public good. For we must be enabled to pay the debts we have contracted on the credit of our existing property, in order that we may at least terminate our political, moral, and material existence with honour and a clean conscience. For we are convinced that the condition in which we shall be placed after the abolition of serfdom will destroy the Russian nobility and reduce it to an historical tradition." In the government of Wladimir several hundred nobles signed an address to the Emperor demanding, as an equivalent for the sacrifices demanded of them, the abolition of titles and hereditary rank, equality of all Russians before the law, freedom of the press, decentralisation, election of government officials, trial by jury, &c.

That a constitutional change in the empire will be an inevitable consequence of the emancipation is the conviction of many leading men. The president of the ministry in par-

ticular, Prince Orloff, uses this as an argument for delay. It is in consequence of a dispute with him that the Grandduke Constantine, the most energetic supporter of emancipation, left the central committee. The popular leader in the work, General Rostoffzoff, became the object of the vehement dislike of the Conservatives. At a public dinner to which he was invited, his health was received with groans. His strength gave way under the heavy responsibility with which he was charged. During his illness little progress was made, and the agitation among the aristocracy increased. Rostoffzoff died on February 18, and was succeeded in the conduct of the emancipation by Count Panin, Minister of Justice and a Conservative. This reactionary appointment heightened the general excitement. The universities have become centres of Liberal opinions. At Charkow the students have framed a constitution for the empire. The Radical and Conservative parties are at open war. In this state of things the deputies of the remaining governments that had not been represented in the first group, last September, assembled at Petersburg. In the beginning of March the Emperor addressed them in the following words: "I wish the condition of the peasants to become not a phrase, but a fact, and that the great change may be accomplished without convulsions. Without some sacrifice on your part, this is impossible; but I desire that the sacrifices of the nobility may be as slight and as imperceptible as possible. I know that there are absurd reports abroad, which may have reached you. It is said that I have withdrawn my confidence from the nobles. That is a falsehood and a calumny. Do not attend to it; but believe me." The discussions began again with great activity between the central committee and the deputies, and lasted often six or eight hours a day. Count Panin, instead of resisting the whole

measure, proves anxious to remove opposition by considering the rights of the nobles.

The difficulty for the government is not only to satisfy the claims of property, but to maintain the absolute authority of the crown, whilst it consults the interests and wishes of a part of the nation. This introduces a new principle into the Russian system. As the nobles only are consulted, and the people, whose interests are chiefly at stake, are not allowed to take part in the deliberations, there is an obvious injustice in the mode of proceeding. It would have been more consistent with justice to the people and with the traditions of the State, if the act of emancipation had been, like the ukase of 1723, which legalised servitude, the free resolution of the crown. Fear of the nobles prevented it, and threatens to make the measures of the government ineffective. A reform of the social condition of Russia is inseparably connected, as all understand, with a reform of the political system, and must be preceded by it. It is impossible for the government to retrace its steps, or deceive the universal expectation. So far nothing has come of it, except manifestations of opinion by which the government is weakened. A solution would be possible by the disappearance of all the smaller proprietors of land and serfs, in whom the opposition resides; for they are threatened with destruction, while the great owners may find their profit in the change. But if the small estates are bought up, the aristocracy will obtain a concentrated power which it is the political object of emancipation to destroy, while the large estates will make the improvement of the cultivation still more difficult. The only probable result of the undertaking, as it now stands, will be an enormous increase of the aggressive power of Russia, without any security at home against tyranny, or any restraint upon ambition.